



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 1,015,511





1





THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION.

FOURTH SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH  
PARLIAMENT OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

55 VICTORIÆ, 1892.

---

VOLUME I.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM  
THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1892,  
TO  
THE THIRD DAY OF MARCH, 1892.

---

First Volume of the Session.

---

COMPANY LIMITED,

NOTE TO THE READER

The paper in this volume is brittle or the  
inner margins are extremely narrow.

We have bound or rebound the volume  
utilizing the best means possible.

PLEASE HANDLE WITH CARE

EDITION.

[8.]

---



THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

AUTHORISED EDITION.

FOURTH SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH  
PARLIAMENT OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

55 VICTORIÆ, 1892.

---

VOLUME I.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM  
THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1892,  
TO  
THE THIRD DAY OF MARCH, 1892.

---

*First Volume of the Session.*

---

REUTER'S TELEGRAM COMPANY, LIMITED,  
24 and 25, Old Jewry, London, E.C.,  
PRINTERS, PUBLISHERS, AND PROPRIETORS OF  
"THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES AUTHORISED EDITION."  
UNDER CONTRACT WITH H.M. GOVERNMENT.

---

1892.

[FOLLOWING VOLUME CCCLVI. OF THE THIRD SERIES.]

5  
301  
, 421

#### ERRATA.

- 12 Feb. Page 351, line 5, should read "Half a year is *not* nothing."  
23 Feb. Page 1100, line 20, should read "Mr. T. E. Ellis."  
25 Feb. Page 1330, line 4, should read "*No, it is not* the same Bill."  
29 Feb. Page 1495, line 22, should read "*Lancashire*, Southport."



# THE MINISTRY

OF THE MOST NOBLE THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, K.G.,  
AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION ON THE 9TH FEBRUARY, 1892.

## THE CABINET.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs . . . . . | Most Hon. Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G..   |
| First Lord of the Treasury . . . . .                                | Right Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.         |
| Lord Chancellor of England . . . . .                                | Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY.                |
| Lord Chancellor of Ireland . . . . .                                | Right Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.               |
| Lord President of the Council . . . . .                             | Right Hon. Viscount CRANBROOK, G.C.S.I.  |
| Lord Privy Seal . . . . .   | Right Hon. Earl CADOGAN.                 |
| Secretary of State, Home Department                                 | Right Hon. HENRY MATTHEWS.               |
| Secretary of State for the Colonies . . . . .                       | Right Hon. Lord KNUTSFORD, G.C.M.G.      |
| Secretary of State for War . . . . .                                | Right Hon. EDWARD STANHOPE.              |
| Secretary of State for India . . . . .                              | Right Hon. Viscount CROSS, G.C.B.        |
| Chancellor of the Exchequer . . . . .                               | Right Hon. GEORGE JOACHIM GOSCHEN.       |
| First Lord of the Admiralty . . . . .                               | Right Hon. Lord GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON. |
| President of the Board of Trade . . . . .                           | Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS BEACH, Bart.  |
| Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster . . . . .                      | His Grace the Duke of RUTLAND, G.C.B.    |
| Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant . . . . .                    | Right Hon. WILLIAM LAWIES JACKSON.       |
| President of the Local Government Board . . . . .                   | Right Hon. CHARLES THOMSON RITCHIE.      |
| President of the Board of Agriculture . . . . .                     | Right Hon. HENRY CHAPLIN.                |

## NOT IN THE CABINET.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Field Marshal Commanding in Chief . . . . .  | H.R.H. the Duke of CAMBRIDGE, K.G.   |
| Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education . . . . .                      | Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Bart.  |
| Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scotch Education Department . . . . . | Most Hon. Marquess of LOTHIAN, K.T.  |
| First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings . . . . .                             | Right Hon. DAVID ROBERT PLUNKET.   |
| Lords of the Treasury . . . . .  | Hon. SIDNEY HERBERT.<br>Colonel Sir WILLIAM HOOD WALROND, Bart.<br>Sir HERBERT EUSTACE MAXWELL, Bart.<br>Admiral Sir R. V. HAMILTON, K.C.B., Vice Admiral Sir A. H. HOSKINS, K.C.B., Vice Admiral H. FAIRFAX, C.B., Rear Admiral JOHN A. FISHER, C.B., Rear Admiral F. G. D. BEDFORD, C.B., ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Esq.   |
| Lords of the Admiralty . . . . .   | Right Hon. ARETAS AKES-DOUGLAS.<br>Right Hon. Sir JOHN ELDON GORST, Q.C.<br>Right Hon. ARTHUR BOWEN FORWOOD.<br>Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH.<br>WALTER H. LONG, Esq.<br>CHARLES BEILBY STUART WORTLEY, Esq.<br>JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, Esq.<br>Right Hon. Baron HENRY DE WORMS.<br>Right Hon. Earl BROWNLOW.<br>Hon. GEORGE N. CURZON.<br>Right Hon. Lord WINDSOR.<br>Right Hon. Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Bart., G.C.S.I.<br>Hon. W. St. JOHN BRODRICK.<br>Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM THACKERAY MARRIOTT.<br>Sir RICHARD EVERARD WEBSTER, Q.C.<br>Sir EDWARD GEORGE CLARKE, Q.C. |
| Joint Secretaries to the Treasury . . . . .  |  |
| Secretary to the Admiralty . . . . .   |  |
| Secretary to the Board of Trade . . . . .  |  |
| Secretary to the Local Government Board . . . . .                                      |  |
| Under Secretary, Home Department . . . . .   |  |
| Under Secretary, Foreign Department . . . . .  |  |
| Under Secretary for Colonies . . . . .   |  |
| Under Secretary for War . . . . .  |  |
| Under Secretary for India . . . . .  |  |
| Paymaster General . . . . .  |  |
| Postmaster General . . . . .   |  |
| Financial Secretary to the War Department . . . . .                                    |  |
| Judge Advocate General . . . . .   |  |
| Attorney General . . . . .   |  |
| Solicitor General . . . . .  |  |

## SCOTLAND.

|                             |                               |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Lord Advocate . . . . .     | Right Hon. Sir C. J. PEARSON. |
| Solicitor General . . . . . | ANDREW GRAHAM MURRAY, Esq.    |

## IRELAND.

|                             |                                     |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Lord Lieutenant . . . . .   | Right Hon. Earl of ZETLAND.         |
| Lord Chancellor . . . . .   | Right Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.          |
| Attorney General . . . . .  | Right Hon. DODGSON HAMILTON MADDEN. |
| Solicitor General . . . . . | J. ATKINSON, Esq.                   |

## QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

|   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Lord Steward . . . . .                              | Right Hon. Earl of MOUNT-EDGUMBE.     |
| Lord Chamberlain . . . . .                          | Right Hon. Earl of LATHOM.            |
| Master of the Horse . . . . .                       | His Grace the Duke of PORTLAND.       |
| Treasurer of the Household . . . . .                | Right Hon. Lord WALTER GORDON-LENNOX. |
| Comptroller of the Household . . . . .              | Right Hon. Lord ARTHUR HILL.          |
| Vice Chamberlain of the Household . . . . .         | Right Hon. Lord BURGHLEY.             |
| Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms . . . . . | Right Hon. Earl of YARBOROUGH.        |
| Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard . . . . .        | Right Hon. Earl of LIMERICK.          |
| Master of the Buckhounds . . . . .                  | Right Hon. Earl of COVENTRY.          |
| Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal . . . . .           | Colonel Sir G. A. MAUDE, V.C., K.C.B. |
| Mistress of the Robes . . . . .                     | Her Grace the Duchess of BUCCLEUCH.   |





# ROLL OF THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN

THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND  
IRELAND.

---

55<sup>o</sup> VICTORIÆ, 1892.

---

MEM.—According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.

His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales.

His Royal Highness Alfred Ernest Albert Duke of Edinburgh.

His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearn.

His Royal Highness Leopold Charles Edward George Albert Duke of Albany.

His Royal Highness George William Frederick Charles Duke of Cambridge.

Edward White Archbishop of Canterbury.

Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor.

William Dalrymple Archbishop of York. Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook, Lord President of the Council.

George Henry Earl Cadogan, Lord Privy Seal.

Henry Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal of England.

Algernon Percy Banks Duke of Somerset.

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Charles Henry Duke of Richmond.   | George Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.   |
| Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of Grafton.  | George William Thomas Marquess of Ailesbury.  |
| Henry Charles Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort.   | Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol.   |
| William Amelius Aubrey de Vere Duke of Saint Albans.  | Archibald Marquess of Ailsa.  |
| George Godolphin Duke of Leeds.   | Constantine Charles Henry Marquess of Normanby.                                       |
| George William Francis Sackville Duke of Bedford.   | George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon.  |
| Spencer Compton Duke of Devonshire.   | William Marquess of Abergavenny.  |
| George Charles Duke of Marlborough.   | Gavin Marquess of Breadalbane.  |
| John James Robert Duke of Rutland.  | Frederick Temple Marquess of Dufferin and Ava.  |
| William Alexander Louis Stephen Duke of Brandon. ( <i>Duke of Hamilton.</i> )                           |   |
| William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland.   | William Henry Earl of Mount Edgumbe, <i>Lord Steward of the Household.</i>            |
| George Victor Drogo Duke of Manchester.   | Edward Earl of Lathom, <i>Lord Chamberlain of the Household.</i>                      |
| Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle.   | Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury.  |
| Algernon George Duke of Northumberland.   | Edward Henry Earl of Derby.   |
| His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale. | Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon.                                   |
| Henry Duke of Wellington.   | George Robert Charles Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.                                |
| George Granville William Duke of Sutherland.  | Henry Hugh Earl of Devon.   |
| Hugh Lupus Duke of Westminster.   | Henry Charles Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire.  |
| Alexander William George Duke of Fife.  | Rudolph William Basil Earl of Denbigh.  |
|   | Anthony Mildmay Julian Earl of Westmorland.   |
| Augustus John Henry Beaumont Marquess of Winchester.  | Montague Earl of Lindsey.   |
| Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne.  | ——— Earl of Stamford.   |
| John Villiers Stuart Marquess Townshend.  | Murray Edward Gordon Earl of Winchelsea and Nottingham.                               |
| Robert Arthur Talbot Marquess of Salisbury.   | Edwyn Francis Earl of Chesterfield.   |
| John Alexander Marquess of Bath.  | Edward George Henry Earl of Sandwich.   |
| James Marquess of Abercorn. ( <i>Duke of Abercorn.</i> )  | Arthur Algernon Earl of Essex.  |
| Hugh de Grey Marquess of Hertford.  | George James Earl of Carlisle.  |
| John Patrick Marquess of Bute.  | William Henry Walter Earl of Doncaster. ( <i>Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry.</i> ) |
| William Alleyne Marquess of Exeter.   | Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury.  |
| William Marquess of Northampton.  | Randal Mowbray Thomas Earl of Berkeley.   |
| John Charles Marquess Camden.   | Montagu Arthur Earl of Abingdon.  |
| Henry Marquess of Anglesey.   |   |

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

Aldred Frederick George Beresford Earl of Scarbrough.

William Coutts Earl of Albemarle.

George William Earl of Coventry.

Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey.

William Henry Earl Poulett.

John Francis Erskine Earl of Mar.  
(*Elected for Scotland.*)

Sholto George Watson Earl of Morton.  
(*Elected for Scotland.*)

Claude Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn.  
(*Elected for Scotland.*)

George Earl of Haddington. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Frederick Henry Earl of Lauderdale.  
(*Elected for Scotland.*)

John Trotter Earl of Lindsay. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

David Stanley William Earl of Airlie.  
(*Elected for Scotland.*)

Ronald Ruthven Earl of Leven and Melville. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Douglas Mackinnon Baillie Hamilton Earl of Dundonald. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Sewallis Edward Earl Ferrers.

William Heneage Earl of Dartmouth.

Charles Earl of Tankerville.

Charles Wightwick Earl of Aylesford.

Francis Thomas De Grey Earl Cowper.

Arthur Philip Earl Stanhope.

Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme Earl of Macclesfield.

Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl Graham. (*Duke of Montrose.*)

William Frederick Earl Waldegrave.

Bertram Earl of Ashburnham.

Charles Augustus Earl of Harrington.

Newton Earl of Portsmouth.

George Guy Earl Brooke and Earl of Warwick.

Sidney Carr Earl of Buckinghamshire.

William Thomas Spencer Earl Fitzwilliam.

Frederick George Earl of Guilford.

Charles Philip Earl of Hardwicke.

Henry Edward Earl of Ilchester.

Reginald Windsor Earl De La Warr.

William Earl of Radnor.

John Poyntz Earl Spencer.

Allen Alexander Earl Bathurst.

Arthur Wills John Wellington Blundell

Trumbull Earl of Hillsborough.

(*Marquess of Downshire.*)

Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon.

William David Earl of Mansfield.

John James Hugh Henry Earl Strange.  
(*Duke of Athole.*)

William Henry Earl of Mount Edgumbe. (*In another Place as Lord Steward of the Household.*)

Hugh Earl Fortescue.

George Edward Stanhope Molyneux Earl of Carnarvon.

George Henry Earl Cadogan. (*In another Place as Lord Privy Seal.*)

Edward James Earl of Malmesbury.

John Vansittart Danvers Earl of Lanesborough. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Henry Ernest Newcomen Earl of Kingston. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Dermot Robert Wyndham Earl of Mayo.  
(*Elected for Ireland.*)

Hugh Earl Annesley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

George Earl of Lucan. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Somerset Richard Earl of Belmore.  
(*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Francis Earl of Bandon. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Earl of Caledon. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Francis Harry Earl of Rosslyn.

William George Robert Earl of Craven.

William Hillier Earl of Onslow.

Charles Earl of Romney.

Walter John Earl of Chichester.

Seymour John Grey Earl of Wilton.

George Charles Earl of Powis.

Horatio Earl Nelson.

Lawrence Earl of Rosse. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Sydney William Herbert Earl Manvers.

Horatio Earl of Orford.

Henry Earl Grey.

Hugh Cecil Earl of Lonsdale.

Dudley Francis Stuart Earl of Harrowby.

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

Henry Thynne Earl of Harewood.  
 Gilbert John Earl of Minto.  
 Alan Frederick Earl Cathcart.  
 James Walter Earl of Verulam.  
 Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl  
     Brownlow.  
 Henry Cornwallis Earl of St. Germans.  
 Albert Edmund Earl of Morley.  
 Orlando George Charles Earl of Brad-  
     ford.  
 William Earl Beauchamp.  
 John Earl of Eldon.  
 Richard William Penn Earl Howe.  
 George Edward John Mowbray Earl of  
     Stradbroke.  
 William Stephen Earl Temple of Stowe.  
 Francis Charles Earl of Kilmorey.  
     *(Elected for Ireland.)*  
 Charles Stewart Earl Vane. *(Marquess*  
     *of Londonderry.)*  
 William Archer Earl Amherst.  
 John Frederick Vaughan Earl Cawdor.  
 William George Earl of Munster.  
 Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of  
     Camperdown.  
 Thomas Francis Earl of Lichfield.  
 John George Earl of Durham.  
 Granville George Earl Granville.  
 Henry Earl of Effingham.  
 Henry John Earl of Ducie.  
 Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yar-  
     borough.  
 James Henry Robert Earl Innes. *(Duke*  
     *of Roxburghe.)*  
 Thomas William Earl of Leicester.  
 William Earl of Lovelace.  
 Lawrence Earl of Zetland.  
 Charles William Francis Earl of Gains-  
     borough.  
 Francis Charles Granville Earl of Elles-  
     mere.  
 George Henry Charles Earl of Strafford.  
 Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of Cot-  
     tenham.  
 William Henry Earl Cowley.  
 Archibald William Earl of Winton.  
     *(Earl of Eglintoun.)*  
 William Humble Earl of Dudley.

John Francis Stanley Earl Russell.  
 Francis Earl of Cromartie.  
 John Earl of Kimberley.  
 Richard Earl of Dartrey.  
 William Ernest Earl of Feversham.  
 Henry George Earl of Ravensworth.  
 Edward Montagu Stuart Granville Earl  
     of Wharnccliffe.  
 Thomas George Earl of Northbrook.  
 Herbert John Earl Cairns.  
 Victor Alexander George Robert Earl of  
     Lytton.  
 Edward Earl of Lathom. *(In another*  
     *Place as Lord Chamberlain of the*  
     *Household.)*  
 George Watson Earl Sondes.  
 Roundell Earl of Selborne.  
 Walter Stafford Earl of Iddesleigh.  
 Cornwallis Earl de Montalt.  
 William Henry Forester Earl of Londes-  
     borough.  
 Robert Viscount Hereford.  
 James David Viscount Strathallan.  
     *(Elected for Scotland.)*  
 Henry Viscount Bolingbroke and St-  
     John.  
 Evelyn Edward Thomas Viscount Fal-  
     mouth.  
 George Master Viscount Torrington.  
 Gerald Viscount Leinster. *(Duke of*  
     *Leinster.)*  
 Francis Wheler Viscount Hood.  
 Mervyn Edward Viscount Powerscourt.  
     *(Elected for Ireland.)*  
 Henry William Crosbie Viscount Bangor.  
     *(Elected for Ireland.)*  
 Cornwallis Viscount Hawarden. *(Elected*  
     *for Ireland.) (In another Place as*  
     *Earl de Montalt.)*  
 Carnegie Parker Viscount St. Vincent.  
 Henry Viscount Melville.  
 William Wells Viscount Sidmouth.  
 John Campbell Viscount Gordon. *(Earl*  
     *of Aberdeen)*  
 Edward Fleetwood John Viscount Ex-  
     mouth.  
 John Luke George Viscount Hutchinson  
     *(Earl of Donoughmore.)*



## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

William Frederick Viscount Clancarty.  
(*Earl of Clancarty.*)

Robert Wellington Viscount Combermere.

Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury.

Rowland Clegg Viscount Hill.

Charles Stewart Viscount Hardinge.

George Stephens Viscount Gough.

Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax.

Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport.

William Henry Berkeley Viscount Portman.

Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook. (*In another Place as Lord President of the Council.*)

Robert Viscount Sherbrooke.

Henry Bouverie William Viscount Hampden.

Garnet Joseph Viscount Wolseley.

William John Viscount Oxenbridge.

Richard Assheton Viscount Cross.

Frederick Bishop of London.

Brooke Foss Bishop of Durham.

Anthony Wilson Bishop of Winchester.

John Thomas Bishop of Norwich.

Charles John Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

James Bishop of Hereford.

Arthur Charles Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Richard Bishop of Chichester.

William Basil Bishop of St. David's.

John Charles Bishop of Liverpool.

Ernest Roland Bishop of Newcastle.

Richard Bishop of Llandaff.

William Bishop of Oxford.

George Bishop of Southwell.

William Boyd Bishop of Ripon.

Edward Bishop of Lincoln.

Edward Henry Bishop of Exeter.

John Bishop of Salisbury.

Alwyne Bishop of Ely.

James Bishop of Manchester.

William Walsham Bishop of Wakefield.

Francis John Bishop of Chester.

Alfred George Bishop of St. Asaph.

Daniel Lewis Bishop of Bangor.

Henry Thurstan Lord Knutsford, *One of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.*

Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.

Alfred Joseph Lord Mowbray.

George Manners Lord Hastings.

Edward Southwell Lord de Clifford.

Gilbert Henry Lord Willoughby de Eresby.

Charles Henry Rolle Lord Clinton.

Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth.

Rawdon George Grey Lord Grey de Ruthyn.

Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botreaux. (*Earl of Loudoun.*)

Francis Robert Lord Camoys.

———— Lord Beaumont.

Henry Lord Willoughby de Broke.

Hubert George Charles Lord Vaux of Harrowden.

Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth.

Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Braye.

Robert George Lord Windsor.

William Henry John Lord North.

Beauchamp Mowbray Lord St. John of Bletso.

Frederick George Lord Howard de Walden.

William Joseph Lord Petre.

John Fiennes Lord Saye and Sele.

John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour.

John Stuart Lord Clifton. (*Earl of Darnley.*)

John Baptist Joseph Lord Dormer.

Henry George Lord Teynham.

Augustus Frederick Fitz-herbert Lord Stafford.

George Frederick William Lord Byron.

Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.

Horace Courtenay Gammell Lord Forbes. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Alexander William Frederick Lord Saltoun. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles William Lord Sinclair. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

Charles Lord Blantyre. (*Elected for Scotland.*)  
 Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. (*Elected for Scotland.*)  
 Walter Hugh Lord Polwarth. (*Elected for Scotland.*)  
 Richard Edmund Saint Lawrence Lord Boyle. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery.*)  
 George Lord Hay. (*Earl of Kinnoul.*)  
 Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton.  
 Frederick George Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. (*Earl of Bessborough.*)  
 Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale.  
 George Florance Lord Boston.  
 Charles George Lord Lovell and Holland. (*Earl of Egmout.*)  
 George William Henry Lord Vernon.  
 Edward Henry Trafalgar Lord Digby.  
 George Douglas Lord Sundridge. (*Duke of Argyll.*)  
 Martin Bladen Lord Hawke.  
 Henry Thomas Lord Foley.  
 Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor.  
 Thomas Lord Walsingham.  
 William Lord Bagot.  
 Charles Henry Lord Southampton.  
 John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley.  
 George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney.  
 Henry George Lord Lovaine.  
 Philip Reginald Lord Somers.  
 Richard Henry Lord Berwick.  
 Edward Lennox Lord Sherborne.  
 Job Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. (*Marquess of Waterford.*)  
 Richard Henry Lord Carleton. (*Earl of Shannon.*)  
 Charles Lord Suffield.  
 Dudley Wilmot Lord Dorchester.  
 Lloyd Lord Kenyon.  
 Charles Cornwallis Lord Braybrooke.  
 George Augustus Hamilton Lord Fishervick. (*Marquess of Donegall.*)  
 Henry Charles Lord Gage. (*Viscount Gage.*)  
 Thomas John Lord Thurlow.  
 William Morton Lord Auckland.

Charles George Lord Lyttelton.  
 Henry George Lord Mendip. (*Viscount Clifden.*)  
 George Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. (*Earl of Moray.*)  
 Alan Plantagenet Lord Stewart of Garlies. (*Earl of Galloway.*)  
 James George Henry Lord Saltersford. (*Earl of Courtown.*)  
 William Lord Brodrick. (*Viscount Middleton.*)  
 Frederick Henry William Lord Calthorpe.  
 Peter Robert Lord Gwydir.  
 Charles Robert Lord Carrington.  
 William Henry Lord Bolton.  
 Thomas Lyttleton Lord Lilford.  
 Thomas Lord Ribblesdale.  
 Edward Donough Lord Inchiquin. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 William Charles Lord Carbery. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 John Thomas William Lord Massy. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Francis William Lord Kilmaine. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Robert Lord Clonbrock. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Charles Mark Lord Headley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Hercules Edward Lord Langford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Henry O'Callaghan Lord Dunalley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Eyre Challoner Henry Lord Clarina. (*Elected for Ireland.*)  
 Henry Francis Seymour Lord Moore. (*Marquess of Drogheda.*)  
 John Henry Lord Loftus. (*Marquess of Ely.*)  
 William Lord Carysfort. (*Earl of Carysfort.*)  
 George Ralph Lord Abercromby.  
 Charles Towry Hamilton Lord Ellenborough.  
 Augustus Frederick Arthur Lord Sandys.

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

North Lord Sheffield. (*Earl of  
Feld.*)

n Macnaghten Lord Erskine.

John Lord Monteagle. (*Mar-  
s of Sligo.*)

d Arthur William Patrick  
tings Lord Granard. (*Earl of  
ard.*)

rford Lord Crewe.

— Lord Gardner.

Thomas Lord Manners.

Adrian Louis Lord Hopetoun.  
(*Earl of Hopetoun.*)

d Lord Castlemaine. (*Elected for  
ind.*)

s Lord Meldrum. (*Marquess of  
ly.*)

Egerton Lord Grinstead.  
(*Earl of Enniskillen.*)

n Hale John Charles Lord Fox-  
(*Earl of Limerick.*)

Albert Francis Charles Lord  
rchill.

Robert Canning Lord Harris.

ld Charles Edward Lord Col-  
ter.

berg Henry Lord Ker. (*Mar-  
s of Lothian.*)

Francis Lord Minster. (*Mar-  
s Conyngham.*)

Edward William Theobald Lord  
onde. (*Marquess of Ormonde.*)

s Richard Lord Wemyss. (*Earl  
emyss.*)

strange Lord Clanbrassill. (*Earl  
oden.*)

s Lord Silchester. (*Earl of Long-  
)*

rthy John Eyre Lord Oriel.  
(*Count Massereene.*)

Lord Delamere.

o Watkin Weld Lord Forester.

William Lord Rayleigh.

Frederic Lord Gifford.

t George Lord Somerhill. (*Mar-  
s of Claircarde.*)

Ludovic Lord Wigan. (*Earl of  
xford and Balcarres.*)

John Mark Lord Ranfurly.  
(*Earl of Ranfurly.*)

John Byrne Leicester Lord De Tabley.

Charles Stuart Henry Lord Tenterden.

William Conyngham Lord Plunket.

William Frederick Lord Heytesbury.

Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. (*Earl  
of Rosebery.*)

Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. (*Earl  
of Clanwilliam.*)

William Draper Mortimer Lord Wyn-  
ford.

Charles Gore Lord Kilmarnock.  
(*Earl of Errol.*)

Arthur James Francis Lord Fingall.  
(*Earl of Fingall.*)

William Philip Lord Sefton. (*Earl of  
Sefton.*)

Robert Bermingham Lord Clements.  
(*Earl of Leitrim.*)

Thomas Lord Kenlis. (*Marquess of  
Headfort.*)

Reginald Lord Chaworth. (*Earl of  
Meath.*)

Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. (*Earl  
of Dunmore.*)

Augustus Frederick George Warwick  
Lord Poltimore.

Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord Mostyn.

Henry Spencer Lord Templemore.

Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry.

John St. Vincent Lord De Saumarez.

Thomas Lord Denman.

James Yorke MacGregor Lord Abinger.

Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.

Francis Denzil Edward Lord Ashburton.

Edward George Percy Lord Hatherton.

Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord  
Worlingham. (*Earl of Gosford.*)

William Frederick Lord Stratheden.

Geoffrey Dominick Augustus Frederick  
Lord Oranmore and Browne. (*Elected  
for Ireland.*)

Simon Joseph Lord Lovat.

William Bateman Lord Bateman.

Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord  
Kintore. (*Earl of Kintore.*)

George Ponsonby Lord Lismore. (*Vis-  
count Lismore.*)

Derrick Warner William Lord Ross-  
more.

## ROLL OF THE LORDS

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Robert Shapland George Julian Lord Carew.                                      | Luke Lord Annaly.  |
| Charles Frederick Ashley Cooper Lord De Mauley.                                | Robert Offley Ashburton Lord Houghton.   |
| Arthur Lord Wrottesley.  | John Gaspard Le Marchant Lord Romilly.   |
| Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley.  | James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. ( <i>Lord Athlumney.</i> )        |
| Paul Sanford Lord Methuen.   | Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. ( <i>Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.</i> )           |
| Henry Edward John Lord Stanley of Alderley.                                    | Charles Stanley Lord Monck. ( <i>Viscount Monck.</i> )                           |
| William Henry Lord Leigh.  | John Major Lord Hartismere. ( <i>Lord Henniker.</i> )                            |
| Beilby Lord Wenlock.   | Hedworth Hylton Lord Hylton.   |
| William Lord Lurgan.   | George Sholto Gordon Lord Penrhyn.   |
| Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon.                                       | Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth. ( <i>Viscount Boyne.</i> )                     |
| John Reginald Upton Lord Seaton.   | John Henry Lord Kesteven.  |
| John Manley Arbuthnot Lord Keane.  | Arthur Lord Ormathwaite.   |
| John Lord Oxenfoord. ( <i>Earl of Stair.</i> )                                 | Edward Lord O'Neill.   |
| Hussey Crespigny Lord Vivian.  | Robert William Lord Napier.  |
| Henry William Lord Congleton.  | Jenico William Joseph Lord Gormanston. ( <i>Viscount Gormanston.</i> )           |
| Denis St. George Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal. ( <i>Electet for Ireland.</i> ) | Thomas Kane Lord Rathdonnell. ( <i>Elected for Ireland.</i> )                    |
| Victor Alexander Lord Elgin. ( <i>Earl of Elgin and Kincardine.</i> )          | John Hamilton Lord Lawrence.   |
| Thomas Montague Morrison Lord Truro.   | James Plaisted Lord Penzance.  |
| Arthur Lord De Freyne.   | John Lord Dunning. ( <i>Lord Rollo.</i> )  |
| Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards.   | James Lord Balinhard. ( <i>Earl of Southesk.</i> )                               |
| George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord Raglan.   | William Lord Hare. ( <i>Earl of Listowel.</i> )                                  |
| Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare. ( <i>Earl of Kenmare.</i> )                   | Francis Edward Lord Howard of Glossop.   |
| Henry Lord Belper.   | Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord Castletown.  |
| Richard Wogan Lord Talbot de Malahide.   | John Emerich Edward Lord Acton.  |
| Robert Lord Ebury.   | Thomas Charles Lord Robartes.  |
| Charles Compton William Lord Chesham.  | Frederick Lord Wolverton.  |
| Frederic Augustus Lord Chelmsford.   | Algernon William Fulke Lord Greville.  |
| John Lord Churston.  | Thomas Towneley Lord O'Hagan.  |
| Henry Lord Leconfield.   | William Lord Sandhurst.  |
| Wilbraham Lord Egerton.  | Francis Lord Ettrick. ( <i>Lord Napier.</i> )                                    |
| Godfrey Charles Lord Tredegar.   | James Charles Herbert Welbore Ellis Lord Somerton. ( <i>Earl of Normanton.</i> ) |
| Fitz Patrick Henry Lord Lyveden.   | Henry Austin Lord Aberdare.  |
| Henry Charles Lord Brougham and Vaux.  | James Lord Moncreiff.  |
| Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaid.   | John Duke Lord Coleridge.  |
| Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord Westbury.                                     | William Lord Emly.   |
| Francis William Fitzhardinge Lord Fitzhardinge.                                | Chichester Samuel Lord Carlingford. ( <i>Lord Clermont.</i> )                    |

## SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Francis Lord Cottesloe.   | Arthur Saunders William Charles Fox<br>Lord Sudley. ( <i>Earl of Arran.</i> )            |
| Henry Lord Hampton.   | John Robert William Lord de Vesci.<br>( <i>Viscount de Vesci.</i> )                      |
| John Lord Winmarleigh.  | Marmaduke Francis Lord Herries.  |
| Alexander Lord Douglas. ( <i>Earl<br/>me.</i> )                   | Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury. ( <i>In<br/>another Place as Lord High Chancellor.</i> ) |
| George Maule Lord Ramsay.<br>( <i>of Dalhousie.</i> )             | Mervyn Edward Lord Powerscourt. ( <i>In<br/>another Place as Viscount Powerscourt.</i> ) |
| Henry Lord Fermanagh. ( <i>Earl<br/>)</i>                         | Anthony Henley Lord Northington.<br>( <i>Lord Henley.</i> )                              |
| Richard Lord Harlech.   | Nathaniel Mayer Lord Rothschild.   |
| Gerard Lord Alington.   | Edward Charles Lord Revelstoke.  |
| James Frederic Lord Tollemache.                                   | Robert Lord Monkswell.   |
| John Cansfield Lord Gerard.                                       | Arthur Lord Hobhouse.  |
| John Sackville Lord Sackville.                                    | Ralph Robert Wheeler Lord Lingen.  |
| John Lord Blackburn.  | Edward Lord Ashbourne.   |
| Bowyer Lord Norton.   | Rowland Lord Saint Oswald.   |
| John Lord Shute. ( <i>Viscount Barrington.</i> )                  | Robert James Lord Wantage.   |
| John Lord Watson. ( <i>A Lord of<br/>the Bench in Ordinary.</i> ) | William Balfour Lord Esher.  |
| John Hesketh Lord Haldon.   | George William Lord Deramore.  |
| John Lord Wimborne.   | Henry John Lord Montagu of Beau-<br>lieu.  |
| Edward Lord Ardilaun.   | William Buller Fullerton Lord Elphin-<br>stone.  |
| Wallace Alexander Napier Lord<br>Angus.                           | Charles John Lord Colville of Culross.   |
| Frederick Lord Donington.   | Farrer Lord Herschell.   |
| Edwin Lord Trevor.  | Charles Henry Lord Hillingdon.   |
| John William Lord Rowton.   | Samuel Charles Lord Hindlip.   |
| John Hugessen Lord Brabourne.                                     | Edmund Lord Grimthorpe.  |
| Oliver Villiers Lord Amphil.                                      | Richard de Aquila Lord Stalbridge.   |
| John Montagu Lord Tweeddale.<br>( <i>Viscount of Tweeddale.</i> ) | William Lord Kensington.   |
| John Ulick Tristram Lord Howth.<br>( <i>Baron of Howth.</i> )     | Michael Arthur Lord Burton.  |
| James Lord Reay.  | John Glencairn Carter Lord Hamilton<br>of Dalzell.                                       |
| John Lord Derwent.  | Thomas Lord Brassey.   |
| James Lord Hothfield.   | Henry Lord Thring.   |
| Coutts Lord Tweedmouth.   | Frederick Arthur Lord Stanley of<br>Preston.   |
| William Wilshire Lord Bram-<br>hall.                              | Edward Lord Macnaghten. ( <i>A Lord<br/>of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )                     |
| John Beauchamp Paget Lord Al-<br>bion.                            | Robert Lord Connemara.   |
| Lord Tennyson.  | Claude Lord Bowes. ( <i>In another Place as<br/>Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne.</i> )  |
| Lord Strathspey. ( <i>Earl of Sea-<br/>forth.</i> )               | George Edmund Milnes Lord Monckton.<br>( <i>Viscount Galway.</i> )                       |
| George Lord Monk Bretton.   | John Lord Saint Levan.   |
| Charles Lord Northbourne.   | James Douglas Lord Magheramorne.   |



## ROLL OF THE LORDS.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| William George Lord Armstrong.   | Michael Lord Morris. ( <i>A Lord Appeal in Ordinary.</i> )  |
| George Lord Basing.  | William Ventris Lord Field.                                 |
| William Henry Lord De Ramsey.  | Francis Richard Lord Sandford.                              |
| William Meriton Lord Cheylesmore.  | Edward Cecil Lord Iveagh.                                   |
| Egerton Lord Addington.  | James Lord Hannen. ( <i>A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.</i> ) |
| Henry Thurstan Lord Knutsford. ( <i>In another Place as one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.</i> ) | George Lord Mount Stephen.                                  |
| John Lord Savile.  | Samuel Lord Masham.   |

---

# LIST OF THE COMMONS.

## THE NAMES OF MEMBERS

RETURNED TO SERVE IN THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, SUMMONED TO MEET AT WESTMINSTER THE FIFTH DAY OF AUGUST, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND EIGHTY SIX, AS BY THE SEVERAL RETURNS FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY APPEARS. CORRECTED TO THE MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT ON THE 9TH FEBRUARY, 1892.

### BEDFORD.

NORTHERN, or BIGGLESWADE DIVISION,  
Viscount Baring.

SOUTHERN, or LUTON DIVISION,  
Earl of Flower.

BEDFORD BOROUGH.  
Sir Samuel Whitbread.

### BERKS.

NORTHERN, or ABINGDON DIVISION,  
Sir Philip Wroughton.

SOUTHERN, or NEWBURY DIVISION,  
Sir William George Mount.

EASTERN, or WOKINGHAM DIVISION,  
Sir George Russell, bt.

READING BOROUGH.  
Sir Charles Townshend Murdoch.

WINDSOR (NEW) BOROUGH.  
Sir Francis Tress Barry.

### BUCKS.

NORTHERN, or BUCKINGHAM DIVISION,  
Sir Herbert Samuel Leon.

MID, or AYLESBURY DIVISION,  
Sir Aaron Ferdinand James de Rothschild.

SOUTHERN, or WYCOMBE DIVISION,  
Sir Viscount Curzon.

### CAMBRIDGE.

NORTHERN, or WISBECH DIVISION,  
Hon. Arthur George Brand.

WESTERN, or CHESTERTON DIVISION,  
Sir Charles Hall, K.C.M.G.

EASTERN, or NEWMARKET DIVISION,  
George Newnes.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.  
Richard Claverhouse Jebb.  
Sir George Gabriel Stokes, bt.

CAMBRIDGE BOROUGH.  
Robert Uniacke Penrose FitzGerald.

### CHESTER.

WIRRAL DIVISION.  
Colonel Edward Thomas Davenant  
Cotton-Jodrell.

EDDISBURY DIVISION,  
Henry James Tollemache.

MACCLESFIELD DIVISION,  
William Bromley Davenport.

CREWE DIVISION,  
Walter Stowe Bright McLaren.

NORTHWICH DIVISION,  
John Tomlinson Brunner.

ALTRINCHAM DIVISION,  
Sir William Cunliffe Brooks, bt.

**CHESTER—cont.****HYDE DIVISION.**

Joseph Watson Sidebotham.

**KNUTSFORD DIVISION,**

Hon. Alan de Tatton Egerton.

**BIRKENHEAD BOROUGH.**General Sir Edward Bruce Hamley,  
K.C.B.**CHESTER BOROUGH.**

Robert Armstrong Yerburch.

**STOCKPORT BOROUGH.**Louis John Jennings,  
Sydney Gedge.**CORNWALL.****WESTERN, or ST. IVES DIVISION,**

Thomas Bedford Bolitho.

**NORTH - WESTERN, or CAMBORNE DIVISION,**

Charles Augustus Vansittart Conybeare.

**TRURO DIVISION,**

William Bickford-Smith.

**MID, or ST. AUSTELL DIVISION,**

William Alexander M'Arthur.

**SOUTH-EASTERN, or BODMIN DIVISION,**

Rt. Hon. Leonard Henry Courtney.

**NORTH-EASTERN, or LAUNCESTON DIVISION,**

Charles Thomas Dyke Acland.

**PENRYN AND FALMOUTH BOROUGH.**

William George Cavendish Bentinck.

**CUMBERLAND.****NORTHERN, or ESKDALE DIVISION,**

Robert Andrew Allison.

**MID, or PENRITH DIVISION,**

James William Lowther.

**COCKERMOUTH DIVISION,**

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, bt.

**WESTERN, or EGREMONT DIVISION,**

Lord Muncaster.

**CARLISLE BOROUGH.**

William Court Gully.

**WHITEHAVEN BOROUGH.**

James Bain, kt.

**DERBY.****HIGH PEAK DIVISION,**

William Sidebottom.

**NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,**

Thomas Dolling Bolton.

**CHESTERFIELD DIVISION,**

Alfred Barnes.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Victor Christian William Cavendish.

**MID DIVISION,**

James Alfred Jacoby.

**ILKESTON DIVISION,**

Sir Balthazar Walter Foster.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**

Henry Wardle.

**DERBY BOROUGH.**

Thomas Roe,

Rt. Hon. Sir William George Gran  
Venables Vernon Harcourt, kt.**DEVON.****EASTERN, or HONITON DIVISION,**

Sir John Henry Kennaway, bt.

**NORTH-EASTERN, or TIVERTON DIVISION,**

Col. Sir William Hood Walrond, bt.

**NORTHERN, or SOUTH MOLTON DIVISION,**

George Lambert.

**NORTH-WESTERN, or BARNSTAPLE DIVISION,**

George Pitt-Lewis.

**WESTERN, or TAVISTOCK DIVISION**

Viscount Ebrington.

**SOUTHERN, or TOTNES DIVISION,**

Francis Bingham Mildmay.

**TORQUAY DIVISION,**

Richard Mallock.

**MID, or ASHBURTON DIVISION,**

Charles Seale-Hayne.

**DEVONPORT BOROUGH.**

Sir John Henry Puleston, kt.

Captain George Edward Price.

**EXETER BOROUGH.**

Hon. Sir H. Stafford Northcote, bt.,

**PLYMOUTH BOROUGH.**

Sir Edward Bates, bt.

Sir Edward George Clarke, kt.

| <i>List of</i>                                | {COMMONS, 1892} | <i>Members.</i>                     |
|---|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>DORSET.</b>                                |                 | <b>ESSEX.</b>                       |
| NORTHERN DIVISION,                            |                 | SOUTH-WESTERN, or WALTHAMSTOW       |
| 1. Edwin Berkeley Portman.                    |                 | DIVISION,                           |
| EASTERN DIVISION,                             |                 | Colonel William Thomas Makins.      |
| 1. Humphry Naipier Sturt.                     |                 | SOUTHERN, or ROMFORD DIVISION,      |
| SOUTHERN DIVISION,                            |                 | James Theobald.                     |
| 1. Liam Ernest Brymer.                        |                 | WESTERN, or EPPING DIVISION,        |
| WESTERN DIVISION,                             |                 | Right Hon. Sir Henry John Selwin-   |
| 1. Harry Richard Farquharson.                 |                 | Ibbetson, bt.                       |
|   |                 | NORTHERN, or SAFFRON WALDEN         |
| <b>DURHAM.</b>                                |                 | DIVISION,                           |
| JARROW DIVISION,                              |                 | Herbert Colstoun Gardner.           |
| Charles Mark Palmer, bt.                      |                 | NORTH-EASTERN, or HARWICH DIVISION, |
| HOUGHTON-LE-SPRING DIVISION,                  |                 | James Round.                        |
| 1. Thomas Wood.                               |                 | EASTERN, or MALDON DIVISION,        |
| CHESTER-LE-STREET DIVISION,                   |                 | Charles Wing Gray.                  |
| 1. James Joicey.                              |                 | MID, or CHELMSFORD DIVISION,        |
| NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,                       |                 | William James Beadel.               |
| 1. W. W. W. Archibald Atherley-Jones.         |                 | SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,             |
| MID DIVISION,                                 |                 | Major Frederic Carne Rasch.         |
| 1. John Wilson.                               |                 | COLCHESTER BOROUGH.                 |
| SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,                       |                 | Lord Brooke.                        |
| 1. Lt.-General Sir Henry Marshman             |                 | WEST HAM BOROUGH.                   |
| 1. Lancelot Lavelock-Allan, bt., V.C., K.C.B. |                 | <i>North Division,</i>              |
| BISHOP AUCKLAND DIVISION,                     |                 | James Forrest Fulton.               |
| 1. James Mellor Paulton.                      |                 | <i>South Division,</i>              |
| BARNARD CASTLE DIVISION,                      |                 | Major George Edward Banes.          |
| Joseph Whitwell Pease, bt.                    |                 |                                     |
| DARLINGTON BOROUGH.                           |                 | <b>GLoucester.</b>                  |
| 1. Theodore Fry.                              |                 | MID, or STROUD DIVISION,            |
| DURHAM BOROUGH.                               |                 | George Holloway.                    |
| 1. Thomas Milvain.                            |                 | NORTHERN, or TEWKESBURY DIVISION,   |
| GATESHEAD BOROUGH.                            |                 | Sir John Edward Dorington, bt.      |
| 1. Walter Henry James.                        |                 | EASTERN, or CIRENCESTER DIVISION,   |
| HARTLEPOOLS (THE) BOROUGH.                    |                 | Arthur Brend Winterbotham.          |
| 1. Christopher Furness.                       |                 | FOREST OF DEAN DIVISION,            |
| SOUTH SHIELDS BOROUGH.                        |                 | Godfrey Blundell Samuelson.         |
| 1. James Cochran Stevenson.                   |                 | SOUTHERN, or THORNBURY DIVISION,    |
| STOCKTON BOROUGH.                             |                 | Lord Dunsany.                       |
| Horace Davey, kt.                             |                 | BRISTOL BOROUGH.                    |
| SUNDERLAND BOROUGH.                           |                 | <i>West Division,</i>               |
| 1. Samuel Storey,                             |                 | Rt. hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks   |
| 1. Edward Temperley Gourley.                  |                 | Beach, bt.                          |

**GLOUCESTER—cont.***North Division,*

Lewis Fry.

*East Division,*

Sir Joseph Dodge Weston.

*South Division,*

Col. Edward Stock Hill, C.B.

**CHELTENHAM BOROUGH.**

James Tynte Agg-Gardner.

**GLOUCESTER BOROUGH.**

Thomas Robinson.

**HANTS.**

NORTHERN, or BASINGSTOKE DIVISION,  
Arthur Frederick Jeffreys.

WESTERN, or ANDOVER DIVISION,  
William Wither Bramston Beach.

EASTERN, or PETERSFIELD DIVISION,  
Viscount Wolmer.

SOUTHERN, or FAREHAM DIVISION,  
General Sir Frederick Wellington John  
Fitz Wygram, bt.

NEW FOREST DIVISION,  
Francis Compton.

CHRISTCHURCH BOROUGH.  
Charles Edward Baring Young.

PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH.  
Major-Gen. Sir William Crossman,  
K.C.M.G.  
Sir Samuel Wilson.

SOUTHAMPTON BOROUGH.  
Alfred Giles,  
Francis H. Evans.

WINCHESTER BOROUGH.  
Richard Moss.

**HEREFORD.**

NORTHERN, or LEOMINSTER DIVISION,  
James Rankin.

SOUTHERN, or ROSS DIVISION,  
Michael Biddulph.

HEREFORD BOROUGH.  
Sir Joseph Russell Bailey, bt.

**HERTFORD.**

NORTHERN, or HITCHIN DIVISION,  
Robert Dimsdale (Baron of the Ru  
Empire).

EASTERN, or HERTFORD DIVISION  
Abel Smith.

MID, or ST. ALBAN'S DIVISION,  
Viscount Grimston.

WESTERN, or WATFORD DIVISION  
Thomas Frederick Halsey.

**HUNTINGDON.**

SOUTHERN, or HUNTINGDON DIVISION,  
Arthur Hugh Smith-Barry.

NORTHERN, or RAMSAY DIVISION,  
Hon. Ailwyn Edward Fellowes.

**ISLE OF WIGHT.**

Sir Richard Everard Webster, kt.

**KENT.**

WESTERN, or SEVENOAKS DIVISION,  
Hon. Charles William Mills.

NORTH-WESTERN, or DARTFORD  
DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, bt.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or TUNBRIDGE  
DIVISION,  
Robert Norton.

MID, or MEDWAY DIVISION,  
Hon. John Stewart Gathorne-Hardy.

NORTH-EASTERN, or FAVERSHAM  
DIVISION,  
Hon. Herbert Thomas Knatchb  
Hugessen.

SOUTHERN, or ASHFORD DIVISION,  
William Pomfret Pomfret.

EASTERN, or ST. AUGUSTINE'S DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Aretas Akers-Douglas.

ISLE OF THANET DIVISION,  
Rt Hon. James Lowther.

CANTERBURY BOROUGH.  
John Henniker Heaton.

NT—*cont.*

**CHATHAM BOROUGH.**

Hon. Sir John Eldon Gorst, kt.

**DEPTFORD BOROUGH.**

Charles John Darling.

**DOVER BOROUGH.**

George Wyndham.

**GRAVESEND BOROUGH.**

John Bazley-White.

**GREENWICH BOROUGH.**

Thomas William Boord.

**HYTHE BOROUGH.**

Edward William Watkin, bt.

**LEWISHAM BOROUGH.**

John Penn.

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH.**

John Wykeham Cornwallis.

**ROCHESTER BOROUGH.**

John Edward Knatchbull-Hugessen.

**WOOLWICH BOROUGH.**

Colonel Edwin Hughes.

---

**LANCASTER.**

**North Lancashire.**

**NORTH LONSDALE DIVISION,**

Liam George Ainslie.

**LANCASTER DIVISION,**

James Williamson.

**BLACKPOOL DIVISION,**

Matthew White Ridley, bt.

**CHORLEY DIVISION,**

Major-General Randle Joseph Feilden,  
M.G.

**North-East Lancashire.**

**DARWEN DIVISION,**

Mount Cranborne.

**CLITHEROE DIVISION,**

Hon. Sir Ughtred James Kay-  
Pitt-Rivuletworth, bt.

**ACCRINGTON DIVISION,**

Robert Trotter Hermon-Hodge.

**ROSENDALE DIVISION,**

John H. Maden.

**LANCASTER—*cont.***

**South-East Lancashire.**

**WESTHOUGHTON DIVISION,**

Frank Hardcastle.

**HEYWOOD DIVISION,**

Isaac Hoyle.

**MIDDLETON DIVISION,**

Thomas Fielden.

**RADCLIFFE-CUM-FARNWORTH DIVISION,**

Robert Leake.

**ECCLES DIVISION,**

Henry John Roby.

**STRETFORD DIVISION,**

John William Maclure.

**GORTON DIVISION,**

William Mather.

**PRESTWICH DIVISION,**

Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray.

**South-West Lancashire.**

**SOUTHPORT DIVISION,**

Hon. George Nathaniel Curzon.

**ORMSKIRK DIVISION,**

Arthur Bower Forwood.

**BOOTLE DIVISION.**

Lt.-Colonel Thomas Myles Sandys.

**WIDNES DIVISION,**

Tom Cottingham Edwards-Moss.

**NEWTON DIVISION,**

Thomas Wodehouse Legh.

**INCE DIVISION,**

Colonel Henry Blundell Hollinshead  
Blundell, C.B.

**LEIGH DIVISION,**

Caleb Wright.

**ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE BOROUGH.**

John Edmund Wentworth Addison.

**BARROW-IN-FURNESS BOROUGH.**

James Archibald Duncan.

**BLACKBURN BOROUGH.**

William Coddington.

William Henry Hornby.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

## BOLTON BOROUGH.

Herbert Shepherd Cross.

Colonel Hon. Francis Charles  
Bridgeman.

## BURNLEY BOROUGH.

J. Spencer Balfour.

## BURY BOROUGH.

Right Hon. Sir Henry James, kt.

## LIVERPOOL BOROUGH.

*Kirkdale Division,*Sir George Smyth Baden-Powell,  
K.C.M.G.*Walton Division,*

Miles Walker Mattinson.

*Everton Division,*

(Vacant)

*West Derby Division,*

Hon. William Henry Cross.

*Scotland Division,*

Thomas Power O'Connor.

*Exchange Division,*

Ralph Neville.

*Abercromby Division,*

William Frederick Lawrence.

*East Toxteth Division,*

Rt. Hon. Baron Henry de Worms.

*West Toxteth Division,*

Thomas Bland Royden.

## MANCHESTER BOROUGH.

*North-West Division,*

Sir William Henry Houldsworth, bt.

*North Division,*

Charles Ernest Schwann.

*North-East Division,*Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, bt.,  
G.C.S.I.*East Division,*

Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.

*South Division,*

Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, kt.

*South-West Division,*

Jacob Bright.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

## OLDHAM BOROUGH.

James Mackenzie Maclean.

Elliott Lees.

## PRESTON BOROUGH.

William Edward Murray Tomlinson.

Robert William Hanbury.

## ROCHDALE BOROUGH.

Thomas Bayley Potter.

## SALFORD BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

Edward Hardcastle.

*West Division,*

Lees Knowles.

*South Division,*

Henry Hoyle Howorth.

## ST. HELENS BOROUGH.

Henry Seton-Karr.

## STALYBRIDGE BOROUGH.

Tom Harrop Sidebottom.

## WARRINGTON BOROUGH.

Sir Gilbert Greenall, bt.

## WIGAN BOROUGH.

Francis Sharp Powell.

## LEICESTER.

## EASTERN, OR MELTON DIVISION,

Marquess of Granby.

## MID, OR LOUGHBOROUGH DIVISION,

Edwin Joseph Lisle March Phillipps  
Lisle.

## WESTERN, OR BOSWORTH DIVISION,

James Ellis.

## SOUTHERN, OR HARBOROUGH DIVISION,

John William Logan.

## LEICESTER BOROUGH.

James Allanson Picton.

Alexander M'Arthur.

## LINCOLN.

WEST LINDSEY, or GAINSBORO'  
DIVISION,

Col. Henry Eyre.

NORTH LINDSEY, or BRIGG DIVISION,  
Samuel Danks Waddy.

EAST LINDSEY, or LOUTH DIVISION,  
Arthur Raymond Heath.

SOUTH LINDSEY, or HORNCASTLE  
DIVISION,  
Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.

NORTH KESTIVEN, or SLEAFORD  
DIVISION,  
Right Hon. Henry Chaplin.

SOUTH KESTIVEN, or STAMFORD DIVI-  
SION,  
Henry John Cokayne Cust.

HOLLAND, or SPALDING DIVISION,  
Halley Stewart.

BOSTON BOROUGH.  
Henry John Farmer-Atkinson.

GRANTHAM BOROUGH.  
Malcolm Low.

GREAT GRIMSBY BOROUGH.  
Right Hon. Edward Heneage.

LINCOLN BOROUGH.  
Frederick Harold Kerans.

## MIDDLESEX.

ENFIELD DIVISION,  
Captain Henry Ferryman Bowles.

TOTTENHAM DIVISION.  
Joseph Howard.

HORNSEY DIVISION,  
Henry Charles Stephens.

HARROW DIVISION,  
William Ambrose.

EALING DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton.

BRENTFORD DIVISION,  
James Bigwood.

UXBRIDGE DIVISION,  
Frederick Dixon Dixon-Hartland.

MIDDLESEX—*cont.*

BETHNAL GREEN BOROUGH.

*North-East Division,*  
George Howell.

*South-West Division,*  
Edward Hare Pickersgill.

CHELSEA BOROUGH.  
Charles Algernon Whitmore.

FINSBURY BOROUGH.  
*Holborn Division,*  
Gainsford Bruce.

*Central Division,*  
Captain Frederick Thomas Penton.

*East Division,*  
James Rowlands.

FULHAM BOROUGH.  
William Hayes Fisher.

HACKNEY BOROUGH.  
*North Division*  
Major-Gen. Sir Lewis Pelly, K.C.B.,  
K.C.S.I.

*Central Division,*  
Surgeon-General Sir William Guyer  
Hunter, K.C.M.G.

*South Division,*  
Sir Charles Russell, kt.

HAMMERSMITH BOROUGH.  
Major-Gen. Walter Tuckfield Golds-  
worthy.

HAMPSTEAD BOROUGH.  
Edward Brodie Hoare.

ISLINGTON BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
George Christopher Trout Bartley.

*West Division,*  
Richard Chamberlain.

*East Division,*  
Cowley Lambert.

*South Division,*  
Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, kt.

KENSINGTON BOROUGH.  
*North Division,*  
Sir Roper Lethbridge, kt., K.C.I.E



*List of*

{COMMONS, 1892}

*Members.*

MIDDLESEX—Kensington Boro'—*cont.*

*South Division,*

Sir Algernon Borthwick, bt.

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

Rt. Hon. Sir John Lubbock, bt.

MARYLEBONE BOROUGH.

*East Division,*

Edmund Boulnois.

*West Division,*

Frederick Seager Hunt.

PADDINGTON BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

John Aird.

*South Division,*

Rt. Hon. Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill.

ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER SQUARE.

Rt. Hon. George Joachim Goschen.

ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH.

*North Division,*

Thomas Henry Bolton.

*East Division,*

Robert Grant Webster.

*West Division,*

Harry Lawson Webster Lawson.

*South Division,*

Sir Julian Goldsmid, bt.

SHOREDITCH BOROUGH.

*Hoxton Division,*

James Stuart.

*Haggerston Division,*

William Randal Cremer.

STRAND BOROUGH.

Hon. William Frederick Danvers Smith.

TOWER HAMLETS BOROUGH.

*Whitechapel Division,*

Samuel Montagu.

*St. George's Division,*

Right Hon. Charles Thomson Ritchie.

*Limehouse Division,*

Edward Samuel Norris.

*Mile End Division,*

Spencer Charrington.

MIDDLESEX—Tower Hamlets Boro'—*α*

*Stepney Division,*

Frederick Wootton Isaacson.

*Bow and Bromley Division,*

Sir John Charles Ready Colon  
K.C.M.G.

*Poplar Division,*

Sydney Charles Buxton.

WESTMINSTER BOROUGH.

William Lehmann Ashmead-Bartl  
Burdett-Coutts.

LONDON CITY.

Henry Hucks Gibbs,

Sir Reginald Hanson, bt.

MONMOUTH.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Thomas Phillips Price.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Cornelius Marshall Warmington.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Col. Hon. Frederick Courtenay Mordaunt.

MONMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir George Elliot, bt.

NORFOLK.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Lord Henry C. Bentinck.

SOUTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

William Amhurst Tyssen Amherst.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Herbert Hardy Cozens-Hardy.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Sir Edward Birkbeck, bt.

MID DIVISION,

Robert Thornhagh Gurdon.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Francis Taylor.

GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir Henry Whatley Tyler, kt.

KING'S LYNN BOROUGH.

Alexander Weston Jarvis.

NORWICH BOROUGH.

Jeremiah James Colman.

Samuel Hoare.

**NORTHAMPTON.**

**NORTHERN DIVISION,**  
Lord Burghley.

**EASTERN DIVISION,**  
Francis Allston Channing.

**MID DIVISION,**  
Hon. Charles Robert Spencer.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**  
Sir Rainald Knightley, bt.

**NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH.**  
Henry Labouchere,  
Moses Philip Manfield.

**PETERBOROUGH BOROUGH.**  
Alpheus Cleophas Morton.

**NORTHUMBERLAND.**

**WANSBECK DIVISION,**  
Charles Fenwick.

**TYNESIDE DIVISION,**  
Wentworth Blackett Beaumont.

**HEXHAM DIVISION,**  
Miles MacInnes.

**BERWICK-UPON-TWEED DIVISION,**  
Sir Edward Grey, bt.

**MORPETH BOROUGH.**  
Thomas Burt.

**NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE BOROUGH.**  
Right Hon. John Morley.  
James Craig.

**TYNEMOUTH BOROUGH.**  
Richard Sim Donkin.

**NOTTINGHAM.**

**BASSETLAW DIVISION,**  
Sir Frederick George Milner, bt.

**NEWARK DIVISION,**  
Viscount Newark.

**RUSHOLIFFE DIVISION,**  
John Edward Ellis.

**MANSFIELD DIVISION,**  
Cecil George Savile Foljambe.

**NOTTINGHAM BOROUGH.**

*West Division,*  
Henry Broadhurst.

*East Division,*  
Arnold Morley.

*South Division,*  
Henry Smith Wright.

**OXFORD.**

**NORTHERN, or BANBURY DIVISION,**  
Sir Bernhard Samuelson, bt.

**MID, or WOODSTOCK DIVISION,**  
George Herbert Morrell.

**SOUTHERN, or HENLEY DIVISION,**  
Hon. Francis Parker.

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY.**

Rt. Hon. Sir John Robert Mowbray,  
bt., D.C.L.

John Gilbert Talbot, D.C.L.

**OXFORD BOROUGH.**

Alexander William Hall.

**RUTLAND.**

George Henry Finch.

**SALOP.**

**WESTERN, or OSWESTRY DIVISION,**  
Stanley Leighton.

**NORTHERN, or NEWPORT DIVISION,**  
Col. William Slaney Kenyon-Slaney.

**MID, or WELLINGTON DIVISION.**  
Alexander Hargreaves Brown.

**SOUTHERN, or LUDLOW DIVISION,**  
Robert Jasper More.

**SHREWSBURY BOROUGH.**  
James Watson.

**SOMERSET.**

**NORTHERN DIVISION,**  
Evan Henry Llewellyn.

**WELLS DIVISION,**  
Colonel Sir Richard Horner Paget, bt.

**FROME DIVISION.**  
Viscount Weymouth.

**EASTERN DIVISION,**  
Henry Hobhouse.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**  
Earl of Cavan.

**BRIDGWATER DIVISION,**  
Edward James Stanley.

**WESTERN, or WELLINGTON DIVISION,**  
Charles Isaac Elton.

SOMERSET—*cont.*

## BATH BOROUGH.

Edmond Robert Wodehouse.

Col. Robert Peter Laurie, C.B.

## TAUNTON BOROUGH.

Hon. Alfred Percy Allsopp.

## STAFFORD.

## LEEK DIVISION,

Harry Tichborne Hinckes.

## BURTON DIVISION,

Sydney Evershed.

## WESTERN DIVISION,

Hamar Alfred Bass.

## NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Captain Justinian Heathcote Edwards-  
Heathcote.

## LICHFIELD DIVISION,

Sir John Swinburne, bt.

## KINGSWINFORD DIVISION,

Alexander Staveley Hill.

## HANDSWORTH DIVISION,

Henry Wiggin.

## HANLEY BOROUGH.

William Woodall.

## NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH.

Douglas Henry Coghill.

## STAFFORD BOROUGH.

Thomas Salt.

## STOKE-UPON-TRENT BOROUGH.

George Granville Leveson-Gower.

## WALSALL BOROUGH.

Edward Thomas Holden.

## WEDNESBURY BOROUGH.

Hon. Philip James Stanhope.

## WEST BROMWICH BOROUGH.

James Ernest Spencer.

## WOLVERHAMPTON BOROUGH.

*West Division,*

Sir William Chichele Plowden, K.C.S.I.

*East Division,*

Rt. Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler.

*South Division,*

Rt. Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers.

## SUFFOLK.

NORTHERN, or LOWESTOFT DIVISION  
Sir Savile Brinton Crossley, bt.NORTH-EASTERN, or EYE DIVISION  
Francis Seymour Stevenson.NORTH-WESTERN, or STOWMARKE  
DIVISION,  
Sydney James Stern.SOUTH, or SUDBURY DIVISION,  
William Cuthbert Quilter.SOUTH-EASTERN, or WOODBRIDGE  
DIVISION,  
Col. Robert Hamilton Lloyd AnstrutBURY ST. EDMUNDS BOROUGH  
Lord Francis Hervey.

## IPSWICH BOROUGH.

Sir Charles Dalrymple, bt.,  
Lord Elcho.

## SURREY.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CHERTSEY  
DIVISION,  
Frederick Alers Hankey.SOUTH-WESTERN, or GUILDFORD  
DIVISION,  
Hon. William St. John Frem  
Brodrick.SOUTH-EASTERN, or REIGATE DIVI  
Sir James John Trevor Lawrence, btMID, or EPSOM DIVISION,  
Rt. Hon. George Cubitt.KINGSTON DIVISION,  
Sir John Whittaker Ellis, bt.NORTH-EASTERN, or WIMBLEDON  
DIVISION,  
Henry Cosmo Orme Bonsor.

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM BOROI

*Battersea Division,*  
Octavius Vaughan Morgan.*Clapham Division,*  
John Saunders Gilliat.

**SURREY—cont.****CAMBERWELL BOROUGH.***North Division,*

John Richards Kelly.

*Peckham Division,*

Arthur Antony Baumann.

*Dulwich Division,*

John Blundell Maple.

**CROYDON BOROUGH.**

Hon. Sidney Herbert.

**LAMBETH BOROUGH.***North Division,*Lieut.-Gen. Charles Craufurd Fraser,  
V.C., C.B.*Kennington Division,*

Mark Hanbury Beaufoy.

*Brixton Division,*

Marquess of Carmarthen.

*Norwood Division,*

Thomas Lynn Bristowe.

**NEWINGTON BOROUGH.***West Division,*

Charles Wallwyn Radcliffe Cooke.

*Waltham Division,*

Lewis Henry Isaacs.

**SOUTHWARK BOROUGH.***West Division,*

Richard Knight Causton.

*Rotherhithe Division,*

Colonel Charles Edward Hamilton.

*Bermondsey Division,*

Alfred Lafone.

**WANDSWORTH BOROUGH.**

Henry Kimber.

**SUSSEX.****NORTH-WESTERN, or HORSHAM DIVISION,**  
Colonel Sir Walter Barttelot Barttelot,  
bt., C.B.**SOUTH-WESTERN, or CHICHESTER  
DIVISION,**

Rt. Hon. Lord Walter C. Gordon Lennox.

**NORTHERN, or EAST GRINSTEAD DIVISION,**  
Hon. Alfred Erskine Gathorne-Hardy.**SUSSEX—cont.****MID, or LEWES DIVISION,**

Sir Henry Fletcher, bt.

**SOUTHERN, or EASTBOURNE DIVISION,**  
Admiral Edward Field.**EASTERN, or RYE DIVISION,**  
Arthur Montagu Brookfield.**BRIGHTON BOROUGH.**Rt. Hon. Sir William Thackeray Mar-  
riott, kt.,

Gerald Walter Erskine Loder.

**HASTINGS BOROUGH.**

Wilson Noble.

**WARWICK.****NORTHERN, or TAMWORTH DIVISION,**  
Philip Albert Muntz.**NORTH-EASTERN, or NUNEATON DIVISION,**  
John Stratford Dugdale.**SOUTH-WESTERN, or STRATFORD-ON-  
AVON DIVISION,**  
Frederick Townsend.**SOUTH-EASTERN, or RUGBY DIVISION,**  
Henry Peyton Cobb.**ASTON MANOR BOROUGH.**Captain George William Grice-Hutchin-  
son.**BIRMINGHAM BOROUGH.***Edgbaston Division,*

George Dixon.

*West Division,*

Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

*Central Division,*

John Albert Bright.

*North Division,*

William Kenrick.

*East Division,*

Right Hon. Henry Matthews.

*Bordesley Division*

Jesse Collings.

*South Division,*

Joseph Powell-Williams.

**WARWICK—cont.****COVENTRY BOROUGH.**

William Henry Walter Ballantine.

**WARWICK & LEAMINGTON BOROUGH.**

Rt. Hon. Arthur Wellesley Peel.

**WESTMORELAND.**NORTHERN, or APPLEBY DIVISION,  
Hon. William Lowther.SOUTHERN, or KENDAL DIVISION,  
Earl of Bective.**WILTS.**NORTHERN, or CRICKLADE DIVISION,  
Mervyn Herbert Nevil Story-Maskelyne.NORTH-WESTERN, or CHIPPENHAM  
DIVISION,  
Lord Henry Bruce.WESTERN, or WESTBURY DIVISION,  
George Pargiter Fuller.EASTERN, or DEVIZES DIVISION,  
Walter Hume Long.SOUTHERN, or WILTON DIVISION,  
Sir Thomas Fraser Grove, bt.**SALISBURY BOROUGH.**  
Edward Henry Hulse.**WORCESTER.**WESTERN, or BEWDLEY DIVISION,  
Sir Edmund Anthony Harley Lech-  
mere, bt.SOUTHERN, or EVESHAM DIVISION,  
Sir Richard Temple, bt., G.C.S.I.MID; or DROITWICH DIVISION,  
John Corbett.NORTHERN DIVISION,  
Benjamin Hingley.EASTERN DIVISION,  
George Woodyatt Hastings.**DUDLEY BOROUGH.**  
Brooke Robinson.**KIDDERMINSTER BOROUGH.**  
Augustus Frederick Godson.**WORCESTER BOROUGH.**  
Hon. George Higginson Allsopp.**YORK.****North Riding,****THIRSK AND MALTON DIVISION,**  
Colonel Hon. Lewis Payn Dawnay.**RICHMOND DIVISION,**  
George William Elliot.**CLEVELAND DIVISION,**  
Henry Fell Pease.**WHITBY DIVISION,**  
Ernest William Beckett.**East Riding,**  
**HOLDERNESS DIVISION,**  
Commander George Richard Bethell, R.**BUCKROSE DIVISION,**  
Christopher Sykes.**HOWDENSHERE DIVISION,**  
Arthur Duncombe.**West Riding, Northern Part,**  
**SKIPTON DIVISION,**  
Walter Morrison.**KEIGHLEY DIVISION,**  
Isaac Holden.**SHIPLEY DIVISION,**  
Joseph Craven.**SOWERBY DIVISION,**  
Edward Crossley.**ELLAND DIVISION,**  
Thomas Wayman.**West Riding, Southern Part,**  
**MORLEY DIVISION,**  
Charles George Milnes-Gaskell.**NORMANTON DIVISION,**  
Benjamin Pickard.**COLNE VALLEY DIVISION,**  
Henry Frederick Beaumont.**HOLMFIRTH DIVISION,**  
Henry Joseph Wilson.**BARNSELY DIVISION,**  
Earl Compton.**HALLAMSHIRE DIVISION,**  
Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin, bt.

**YORK—*cont.***

ROTHERHAM DIVISION,  
■ Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland.

DONCASTER DIVISION,  
Hon. W. Henry W. Fitzwilliam.

West Riding, Eastern Part,  
RIPON DIVISION,  
John Lloyd Wharton.

OTLEY DIVISION,  
John Barran.

BARKSTON ASH DIVISION,  
Colonel Robert Gunter.

OSGOLDCROSS DIVISION,  
John Austin.

PUDSEY DIVISION,  
Briggs Priestley.

SPEN VALLEY DIVISION,  
Joseph Woodhead.

BRADFORD BOROUGH,  
*West Division*,  
Alfred Illingworth.

*Central Division*,  
Right Hon. John George Shaw Lefevre.

*East Division*,  
Henry Byron Reed.

DEWSBURY BOROUGH,  
Mark Oldroyd.

HALIFAX BOROUGH,  
Thomas Shaw,  
Rt. Hon. James Stansfeld.

HUDDERSFIELD BOROUGH,  
William Summers.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL BOROUGH,  
*East Division*,  
Frederick Brent Grotrian.

*Central Division*,  
Henry Seymour King.

*West Division*,  
Charles Henry Wilson.

LEEDS BOROUGH,  
*North Division*,  
Right Hon. William Lawies Jackson.

**YORK—*cont.***

*Central Division*,  
Gerald William Balfour.

*East Division*,  
John Lawrence Gane.

*West Division*,  
Herbert John Gladstone.

*South Division*,  
Rt. Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B.

MIDDLESBROUGH BOROUGH,  
Isaac Wilson.

PONTEFRAC T BOROUGH,  
Hon. Rowland Winn.

SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH,  
Joshua Rowntree.

SHEFFIELD BOROUGH,  
*Attercliffe Division*,  
Hon. Bernard John Seymour Coleridge.

*Brightside Division*,  
Rt. Hon. Anthony John Mundella.

*Central Division*,  
Colonel Charles Edward Howard Vincent, C.B.

*Hallam Division*,  
Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley.

*Ecclesall Division*,  
Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett.

WAKEFIELD BOROUGH,  
Sir Edward Green, bt.

YORK BOROUGH,  
Alfred Edward Pease.  
Frank Lockwood.

---

---

**W A L E S .**

—  
ANGLESEA.  
Thomas P. Lewis.

BRECKNOCK.  
William Fuller Maitland.

CARDIGAN.  
William Bowen Rowlands.

**CARMARTHEN.**

**EASTERN DIVISION,**

Abel Thomas.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

John Lloyd Morgan.

**CARMARTHEN BOROUGH.**

Sir Emile Algernon Arthur Keppel  
Stepney-Cowell, bt.

**CARNARVON.**

**SOUTHERN OR EIFION DIVISION,**

John Bryn Roberts.

**NORTHERN OR ARFON DIVISION,**

William Rathbone.

**CARNARVON BOROUGH.**

David Lloyd-George.

**DENBIGH.**

**EASTERN DIVISION,**

Rt. Hon. George Osborne Morgan.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Colonel William Cornwallis West.

**DENBIGH BOROUGH.**

Hon. George Thomas Kenyon.

**FLINT.**

Samuel Smith.

**FLINT BOROUGH.**

John Roberts.

**GLAMORGAN.**

**EASTERN DIVISION,**

Alfred Thomas.

**RHONDDA DIVISION,**

William Abraham.

**WESTERN OR GOWER DIVISION,**

David Randell.

**MID DIVISION,**

Samuel Thomas Evans.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**

Arthur John Williams.

**CARDIFF BOROUGH.**

Sir Edward James Reed, K.C.B.

**MERTHYR TYDVIL BOROUGH.**

David Alfred Thomas.

W. Pritchard Morgan.

**SWANSEA BOROUGH.**

*Swansea, Town,*

Lewis Llewelyn Dillwyn.

*Swansea, District,*

Sir Henry Hussey Vivian, bt.

**MERIONETH.**

Thomas Edward Ellis.

**MONTGOMERY.**

Stuart Rendel.

**MONTGOMERY BOROUGH.**

Hon. Frederick Stephen Archibald Han-  
bury-Tracy.

**PEMBROKE.**

William Davies.

**PEMBROKE AND HAVERFORDWEST  
BOROUGH.**

Adm. Richard Charles Mayne, C.B.

**RADNOR.**

Hon. Arthur Henry John Walsh.

**SCOTLAND.**

**ABERDEEN.**

**EASTERN DIVISION,**

Peter Esslemont.

**WESTERN DIVISION,**

Robert Farquharson, M.D.

**ABERDEEN BURGH.**

*North Division,*

William Alexander Hunter.

*South Division,*

James Bryce.

**ARGYLL.**

Colonel John Wingfield Malcolm.

**AYR.**

**NORTHERN DIVISION,**

Hon. Hugh Frederick Hislop Elliot.

**SOUTHERN DIVISION,**

Hon. Greville Richard Vernon.

**AYR DISTRICT OF BURGHES.**

James Somervell.

**KILMARNOCK DISTRICT OF BURGHES**

Stephen Williamson.

## BANFF.

Robert William Duff.

## BERWICK.

Right Hon. Edward Marjoribanks.

## BUTE.

Andrew Graham Murray.

## CAITHNESS.

Gavin Brown Clark.

## WICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Macdonald Cameron.

## CLACKMANNAN AND KINROSS.

Rt. Hon. John Blair Balfour.

## DUMBARTON.

Sir Archibald Orr Ewing, bt.

## DUMFRIES.

Sir Robert Jardine, bt.

## DUMFRIES DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Threshie Reid.

## EDINBURGH (MID LoTHIAN).

Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

## EDINBURGH BURGHS.

*East Division,*

Robert Wallace.

*West Division,*

Thomas Ryburn Buchanan.

*Central Division,*

William McEwan.

*South Division,*

Rt. Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers.

## EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITIES.

Sir Charles John Pearson, kt.

## LEITH DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Ronald Crawford Munro Ferguson.

## ELGIN AND NAIRN.

John Seymour Keay.

## ELGIN DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Alexander Asher.

## FIFE.

## EASTERN DIVISION,

Herbert Henry Asquith.

## WESTERN DIVISION,

Augustine Birrell.

## KIRKCALDY DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Sir George Campbell, kt., K.G.S.I.

## ST. ANDREW'S DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Henry Torrens Anstruther.

## FORFAR.

James William Barclay.

## DUNDEE BURGHS.

Edmund Robertson.

John Leng.

## MONTROSE DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Shires Will.

## HADDINGTON.

Richard Burdon Haldane.

## INVERNESS.

Charles Fraser-Mackintosh.

## INVERNESS DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Bannatyne Finlay.

## KINCARDINE.

General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B.

## KIRKCUDBRIGHT.

Mark John Stewart.

## LANARK.

## GOVAN DIVISION,

John Wilson.

## PARTICK DIVISION,

James Parker Smith.

## NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Robert Bontine Cunninghame Graham.

## NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,

Donald Crawford.

## MID-DIVISION,

John Wynford Philipps.

## SOUTHERN DIVISION,

James Henry Cecil Hozier.



**LANARK—cont.**

GLASGOW BURGH.

*Bridgeton Division,*

Rt. Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, bt.

*Camlachie Division,*

Hugh Watt.

*St. Rollox Division.*

James Caldwell.

*Central Division,*

John George Alexander Baird.

*College Division.*

Charles Cameron, M.D., LL.D.

*Tradeston Division,*

Archibald Cameron Corbett.

*Blackfriars and Hutchesontown Division,*

Andrew Dryburgh Provand.

GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITIES.

James Alexander Campbell, LL.D.

LINLITHGOW.

Peter McLagan.

ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

Leonard Lyell.

PEEBLES AND SELKIRK.

Walter Thorburn.

PERTH.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Sir John George Smyth Kinloch, bt.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Sir Donald Currie, K.C.M.G.

PERTH BURGH.

Charles Stuart Parker.

RENFREW.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Michael Hugh Shaw-Stewart.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Sir Archibald Campbell Campbell, bt.

GREENOCK BURGH.

Sir Thomas Sutherland.

PAISLEY BURGH.

William Dunn.

ROSS AND CROMARTY.

Dr. Roderick M'Donald.

ROXBURGH.

Hon. Arthur Ralph Douglas Elliot.

HAWICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Alexander Laing Brown.

STIRLING.

Joseph Cheney Bolton.

FALKIRK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

William Pirrie Sinclair.

STIRLING DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

SUTHERLAND.

Angus Sutherland.

WIGTON.

Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, bt.

---

---

**I R E L A N D .**

—  
ANTRIM.

NORTH ANTRIM DIVISION,

Sir Charles Edward Lewis, bt.

MID ANTRIM DIVISION,

Hon. Robert Torrens O'Neill.

EAST ANTRIM DIVISION,

Captain James Martin M'Calmont.

SOUTH ANTRIM DIVISION,

William Grey Ellison Macartney.

BELFAST BOROUGH.

*North Belfast Division,*

Sir Edward James Harland, bt.

*East Belfast Division*

Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain.

*South Belfast Division,*

William Johnston.

*West Belfast Division*

Thomas Sexton.

## ARMAGH.

NORTH ARMAGH DIVISION,  
al Edward James Saunderson.

MID ARMAGH DIVISION,  
ar Plunket Barton.

SOUTH ARMAGH DIVISION,  
nder Blane.

## CARLOW.

Hammond.

## CAVAN.

WEST CAVAN DIVISION,  
nd Francis Vesey Knox.

EAST CAVAN DIVISION.  
as O'Hanlon.

## CLARE.

EAST CLARE DIVISION,  
1 Richard Cox.

WEST CLARE DIVISION,  
iah Jordan.

## CORK.

NORTH CORK DIVISION,  
Christopher Flynn.

NORTH-EAST CORK DIVISION,  
m O'Brien.

MID CORK DIVISION,  
arles Kearns Deane Tanner.

EAST CORK DIVISION,  
m John Lane.

WEST CORK DIVISION,  
Gilhooly.

SOUTH CORK DIVISION,  
1 Edward Kenny.

SOUTH-EAST CORK DIVISION,  
Morrough.

## CORK CITY.

1 Flavin.  
ce Healy.

## DONEGAL.

NORTH DONEGAL DIVISION,  
James Rochfort Maguire.

WEST DONEGAL DIVISION,  
James Joseph Dalton.

EAST DONEGAL DIVISION,  
Arthur O'Connor.

SOUTH DONEGAL DIVISION,  
John Gordon Swift Mac Neill.

## DOWN.

NORTH DOWN DIVISION,  
Colonel Thomas Waring.

EAST DOWN DIVISION,  
James Alexander Rentoul, LL.D.  
Patrick M'Dermott.

WEST DOWN DIVISION,  
Right Hon. Lord Arthur Hill.

SOUTH DOWN DIVISION,  
Michael McCartan.

NEWRY BOROUGH.  
Justin Huntly McCarthy.

## DUBLIN.

NORTH DUBLIN DIVISION,  
John Joseph Clancy, M.A.

SOUTH DUBLIN DIVISION,  
Sir Thomas Henry Grattan Esmonde, bt.

## DUBLIN CITY.

*College Green Division,*  
Timothy Daniel Sullivan.

*Dublin Harbour Division,*  
Timothy Charles Harrington.

*St. Stephen's Green Division,*  
Thomas Alexander Dickson.

*St. Patrick's Division,*  
William Martin Murphy.

## DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.

Rt. Hon. David Robert Plunket, LL.D.  
Rt. Hon. Dodgson Hamilton Madden.

## FERMANAGH.

NORTH FERMANAGH DIVISION,  
William Hoey Kearney Redmond.

SOUTH FERMANAGH DIVISION,  
Henry Campbell.

## GALWAY.

CONNEMARA DIVISION,  
Patrick James Foley.

NORTH GALWAY DIVISION,  
Colonel John Philip Nolan.

EAST GALWAY DIVISION,  
John Roche.

SOUTH GALWAY DIVISION,  
David Sheehy.

GALWAY TOWN.  
John Pinkerton.

## KERRY.

NORTH KERRY DIVISION,  
John Stack.

WEST KERRY DIVISION,  
Edward Harrington.

SOUTH KERRY DIVISION,  
Denis Kilbride.

EAST KERRY DIVISION  
Jeremiah Daniel Sheehan.

## KILDARE.

NORTH KILDARE DIVISION  
James Laurence Carew.

SOUTH KILDARE DIVISION,  
James Leahy.

## KILKENNY.

NORTH KILKENNY DIVISION,  
Patrick M'Dermott.

SOUTH KILKENNY DIVISION,  
Patrick Alexander Chance.

KILKENNY CITY.  
Thomas Quinn.

## KING'S COUNTY.

BIRK DIVISION,  
Bernard Charles Molloy.

TULLAMORE DIVISION,  
Dr. Joseph Francis Fox.

## LEITRIM.

NORTH LEITRIM DIVISION,  
Michael Conway.

SOUTH LEITRIM DIVISION,  
Luke Patrick Hayden.

## LIMERICK.

WEST LIMERICK DIVISION,  
William Abraham.

EAST LIMERICK DIVISION,  
John Finucane.

LIMERICK CITY.  
Francis A. O'Keeffe.

## LONDONDERRY.

NORTH DERRY DIVISION,  
Henry Lyle Mulholland.

SOUTH DERRY DIVISION,  
Thomas Lea.

LONDONDERRY CITY.  
Justin M'Carthy.

## LONGFORD.

NORTH LONGFORD DIVISION,  
Timothy Michael Healy.

SOUTH LONGFORD DIVISION,  
James G. Fitzgerald.

## LOUTH.

NORTH LOUTH DIVISION,  
Joseph Nolan.

SOUTH LOUTH DIVISION,  
Thomas Patrick Gill.

## MAYO.

NORTH MAYO DIVISION,  
Daniel Crilly.

WEST MAYO DIVISION,  
John Deasy.

EAST MAYO DIVISION,  
John Dillon.

SOUTH MAYO DIVISION,  
James Frederick Xavier O'Brien.

## MEATH.

NORTH MEATH DIVISION,  
Pierce Mahony.

SOUTH MEATH DIVISION,  
Edward Sheil.

**MONAGHAN.**

NORTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,  
Patrick O'Brien.

SOUTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,  
Sir Joseph Neal M'Kenna, kt.

**QUEEN'S COUNTY.**

OSSORY DIVISION,  
William Archibald Macdonald.

LEIX DIVISION,  
Richard Lalor.

**ROSCOMMON.**

NORTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,  
James J. O'Kelly.

SOUTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,  
Andrew Commins, LL.D.

**SLIGO.**

NORTH SLIGO DIVISION,  
Bernard Collery.

SOUTH SLIGO DIVISION,  
Edmund Leamy.

**TIPPERARY.**

NORTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Patrick Joseph O'Brien.

MID TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Henry Harrison.

SOUTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
John O'Connor.

EAST TIPPERARY DIVISION,  
Thomas Joseph Condon.

**TYRONE.**

NORTH TYRONE DIVISION,  
Lord Ernest W. Hamilton.

**TYRONE—cont.**

MID TYRONE DIVISION,  
Matthew Joseph Kenny.

EAST TYRONE DIVISION,  
William James Reynolds.

SOUTH TYRONE DIVISION,  
Thomas Wallace Russell.

**WATERFORD.**

WEST WATERFORD DIVISION,  
Alfred Webb.

EAST WATERFORD DIVISION,  
Patrick Joseph Power.

WATERFORD CITY.  
John Edward Redmond.

**WESTMEATH.**

NORTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,  
James Tuite.

SOUTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,  
Donald Sullivan.

**WEXFORD.**

NORTH WEXFORD DIVISION,  
(Vacant.)

SOUTH WEXFORD DIVISION,  
John Barry.

**WICKLOW.**

WEST WICKLOW DIVISION,  
Garrett Michael Byrne.

EAST WICKLOW DIVISION,  
William Joseph Corbet.



# REUTER'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF  
THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND  
APPOINTED TO MEET 5 AUGUST, 1886, IN THE FIFTIETH YEAR  
OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

---

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1892.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 9th February, 1892.*

**T**HE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued successively from Wednesday the 5th day of August, 1891, to Tuesday the 20th day of October, 1891, thence to Thursday, the 10th day of December, 1891, and thence to Tuesday the 9th day of February, 1892, met this day for the despatch of business.

The Session was opened by Commission.

The House of PEERS being met,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House,

"That Her Majesty, not thinking it fit to be present here this day, has been pleased to cause a Commission to be issued under the Great Seal, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament."

Then Five of the LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely, the LORD CHANCELLOR—

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

LOR, the Duke of PORTLAND, the Earl of COVENTRY, the Earl of MOUNT-EDGCUMBE, and the Viscount CROSS—being in their robes and seated on a form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack—commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the COMMONS know,

"The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate attendance in this House to hear the Commission read."

Who being at the Bar, with their Speaker:—The Commission was read by the Clerk:—Then

## THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR delivered HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH to both Houses of Parliament as follows:—

*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I am persuaded that you have deeply participated in the terrible sorrow which has afflicted me and my family in the loss, at the moment when the prospects of his life appeared the

B

happiest, of my dearly beloved Grandson, Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale. It has been a solace to us in our grief to have received from all classes and conditions of my subjects, from all parts of my Empire, as well as from all foreign countries, the most touching assurances of their deep sympathy under this grievous affliction, and the expression of their affectionate regard and appreciation for the dear young Prince whom they have lost by this great calamity.

My relations with other Powers continue to be friendly. I have lost in the Viceroy of Egypt a loyal ally, whose wise government had, in the space of a few years, largely contributed to restore prosperity and peace to his country.

I have an entire confidence that the same sagacious policy will be followed by his son, who has been named as his successor, in accordance with previous Firmans, by His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.

An Agreement has been concluded with the United States, defining the mode in which the disputes as to seal fisheries in Behring's Sea shall be referred to arbitration.

Zanzibar has been established as a free port by his Highness the Sultan, with my concurrence. I trust that this measure will conduce both to the development of the Sultan's dominions and to the promotion of British commerce on the East African Coast.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

The Estimates for the Public Service of the ensuing year will be laid before you. They have been prepared with a due regard to financial economy.

*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

Proposals will be laid before you for applying to Ireland the general principles affecting Local Government, which have already been adopted in Great Britain; and I trust that it may be possible to consider the provisions as

to English Local Government which, for want of time, it was necessary to omit from the former Bill.

A measure for increasing the number of small holdings of land in agricultural districts in Great Britain will be submitted for your approval.

You will be asked to consider a Bill for extending the advantages of Assisted Education to Ireland, and for other purposes connected with Elementary Education in that country.

A scheme for modifying the existing system of procedure on Private Bills, so far as it affects Scotland and Ireland, will be brought before you.

A measure will be introduced for the improvement of the Legislative Councils in India.

A Bill will be laid before you for relieving Public Elementary Schools in England from the present pressure of local rates.

Proposals for improving the discipline of the Established Church in regard to moral offences; for enabling accused persons to be examined on their trial; for revising the existing Agreements between the Government and the Bank of England; and for amending the Law with respect to the liability of employers for injuries incurred in their employment, will also be commended to your attention.

I pray that Almighty God may guide you in the performance of your weighty functions.

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

PRAYERS.

#### ROLL OF THE LORDS.

Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Seventh Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

#### REPRESENTATIVE PEER FOR IRELAND.

Writs and Returns electing the Lord Dunalley a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Earl of Wicklow, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto: *delivered* (on oath), and Certificate read.

#### REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.

The Clerk of the Parliaments delivered a certificate of the Clerk of the Crown that the Earl of Leven and Melville had been elected a Representative Peer for Scotland in the room of the Earl of Northesk: Certificate read.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had received (by post) from the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland,

Minutes of the election of the Earl of Leven and Melville as one of the sixteen Peers of Scotland, 10th December last, in room of George John Earl of Northesk, deceased; and

Separate Return by the Lord Clerk Register of certain Titles of Peerage called at the said election, in right of which respectively no vote had been received and counted at any election for fifty years then last past (pursuant to Act 14th and 15th Vict., chap. 87.):

Ordered that the said Minutes of Election, &c. be *printed*. (No. 1.)

#### SAT FIRST IN PARLIAMENT.

The Earl of Dartmouth—After the death of his father.

The Duke of Devonshire, after the death of his father.

The Lord Cheylesmore, after the death of his father.

Several Lords took the oath.

William Dalrymple, Lord Archbishop of York, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Francis John, Lord Bishop of Chester was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Alfred George, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

#### THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The QUEEN'S SPEECH reported by the LORD CHANCELLOR.

THE EARL OF DUDLEY (who wore the uniform of the Worcestershire Yeomanry) in moving an Address of Thanks in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, said: My Lords, in rising to move the Address in answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech from the Throne, I would plead with your Lordships for a full measure of that indulgence which is usually accorded to those who address this House for the first time. I will not detain you for a longer time than I can help, but will endeavour to carry out as quickly and as concisely as possible the duty that I now have the honour to perform. My Lords, before dealing directly with the political subjects touched upon in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech, I feel that I must give expression to the sentiment that I am sure is uppermost in the mind of every member of this august Assembly; a sentiment which appeals to me the more strongly from the fact that it was my father who had the honour of moving the Address in this House the year that their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales were married. For we meet to-day, my Lords, under circumstances of very exceptional sorrow and solemnity. Anevent, which for tragic pathos stands unrivalled in the recorded annals of this country, has taken place during the last month; no adjunct is wanting to complete the mournfulness of the picture. One whom we looked on as the future Ruler of this Empire has been cut off in the opening of a life full of the brightest promise: on the very eve of his marriage—a marriage which seemed destined to crown his happiness, and to complete his opportunities for public influence and usefulness. It is not too much to say that the struggle between life and death has been watched with the most intense interest by every subject of Her Majesty—indeed, by the whole civilized world. Nor is it any exaggeration to add that the sad history of that struggle has cast a gloom over public and private



life in this country ; that it has brought home to us in a most strongly marked form the grave possibilities by which every human undertaking has to be qualified ; and that, under the shadow of this national calamity, the energy of political movement, and the acrimony of Party difference has been mitigated for the time ; while all alike have joined in no mere formal expression of sympathy and commiseration with those who have to mourn not only a public catastrophe, but a domestic bereavement of a most heartrending character. And though, my Lords, such sympathy can, unfortunately, but to a small extent alleviate the grief which has fallen so heavily upon our Royal House, yet it has furnished, in a way which perhaps less tragic circumstances could not have done, an additional and unmistakeable token of the loyalty and devotion that unites our Rulers to the hearts and affections of their people. This spontaneous outburst of condolence and commiseration is but an illustration of the general recognition that our monarchical institutions are interwoven in the very texture of our national life : that the interests of Sovereign and subject are identical : and that what seriously affects the one cannot but be of vital importance to the other. Turning now, my Lords, to the political subjects dealt with in Her Majesty's Speech, we are pleased to note that the relations of this country with Foreign Powers continue to be of a friendly character. The foreign policy of this country is one that can never lack interest or significance. We have dependencies in most parts of the world, and our connection with them, as well as our wide-spread trade, bring us into relation with a far more extensive range of rights and responsibilities than is the case with any other nation ; and it is a matter of sincere congratulation that the many difficulties and complications which must necessarily arise in the maintenance of those rights, and in the discharge of those responsibilities, continue to be arranged by peaceful and diplomatic methods. The firm and consistent policy of the present Government with regard to Egypt, notwithstanding the many difficulties it has had to overcome, and notwithstanding the many

criticisms that it has aroused in some quarters, continues to bear nothing but good results. The internal disturbances of that country have gradually subsided ; tranquillity is still maintained ; a settled order of things has been established ; and any feeling of hostility towards our troops quartered there has now entirely disappeared. Our continued occupation of the country has been made the more necessary through the death of the Khedive and the succession of his son to the Throne. The late Khedive was undoubtedly a man of great power and ability, and his hearty and intelligent co-operation in all our efforts for the establishment of peace and order have had no doubt much to do with the success of those efforts. But, my Lords, not only in Egypt but elsewhere the extension of our trade and colonisation must necessarily cause many small frictions in places where our interests seem to come into collision with those of other States ; and I hope that it will not be considered presumptuous on my part if I say that it is owing, to a great extent, to the abilities of one, who, as Foreign Minister, has been rarely equalled and never surpassed, that those frictions have been removed and a good understanding re-established. The peaceful condition of our external affairs has given the time and opportunity necessary for carrying out many useful measures of home legislation—an opportunity which Her Majesty's Government has made full use of during the last year ; and it is satisfactory for us now to hear that their efforts in this respect will be continued during the coming Session. The affairs of Ireland have occupied a considerable proportion of the attention of our legislators during the last few years, and Her Majesty now informs us that it is proposed to complete the edifice of social and political amelioration by two very important additions. The first of these is a measure for the advancement of education. The fact that the standard of education in Ireland is much below what it is in this country proves that such a measure is not unnecessary—proves the justice both of the demand that the people of Ireland should be given equal oppor-

tunities of gaining useful knowledge, and of preparing themselves for their vocations in life; and it is also a matter of importance that they should not, in educating their children, be called upon to make any larger sacrifices in such respects than the inhabitants of England or Scotland. Her Majesty's Irish subjects are by no means wanting in intelligence; they are certainly on an intellectual equality with the people of any other part of the British Isles; but the fact that so large a proportion of the electorate now vote as illiterate, points most strongly to the conclusion that it is their present deficiency in knowledge and information which renders them, hot-headed and excitable as they are by nature, easily liable to be imposed upon and incited to crime by the numerous mischievous agitators who have of late exercised so evil an influence. The second matter with which Her Majesty's Government proposes to deal is that of local government. The desirability of extending the principles of the Local Government Act of 1888 to Ireland is a subject which has caused much discussion, and one on which opinion is by no means even yet unanimous; it must be borne in mind, however, that, until some such extension has been effected, the programme which the present Government laid before the country at the last general election will be incomplete, and a promise very definitely made at the time will be unredeemed. Up to a very short time ago, however, law and order in Ireland were not in a state such as to justify a prudent Government in making any extension of power to the people of that country for the management of their home affairs; and it is now a matter of great satisfaction to us to learn that, in the opinion of those who are responsible for the granting or withholding of such a measure, the time has now arrived when they deem it fit to give the Irish people local powers similar to, if not identical with, those at present possessed by the English counties. That the subject is one which is surrounded by considerable difficulty will be generally admitted, and no measure of this kind is likely to be approved which does not safeguard the rights of the minority, or which

does not provide adequate guarantees against the abuse of such powers for the purpose of political agitation. How such objects can best be attained will probably form one of the chief elements of the discussion on the measure; but that they can be attained admits of no reasonable doubt. And, at all events, it would be quite possible to retain the right of dissolving any particular Council that went beyond the discharge of its legitimate functions. And, my Lords, the very fact that such a measure would more completely assimilate the institutions of two closely connected parts of the same nation, gives ground for hope that it would do much to remove any sense of grievance that might now be felt by our Irish fellow-countrymen. Her Majesty also informs us that a Bill for facilitating the process of private Bill legislation for Scotland and Ireland will occupy the attention of Parliament. As the noble Lord who seconds this Address hails from the former country, he will be far more capable of laying the points connected with the Bill before your Lordships than I am; and I would merely say that the aim of such a measure must be to fulfil this primary object, of making it more easy to legislate upon matters of local importance by relieving to some extent the stress of business in Parliament—not depriving that body of any of the rights which it at present possesses. Another subject of very great importance that Her Majesty informs us will be dealt with during the coming Session is that of small holdings. Much is being said, my Lords, about the present state of the rural districts, and statements are being made from time to time with regard to them which would seem to imply that those districts are surely and steadily becoming depopulated: that their inhabitants are gradually betaking themselves from them and migrating to the towns. Such statements, however, contain large elements of exaggeration. As a matter of fact, our rural districts are not becoming depopulated. The population there indeed is not increasing, but neither is it diminishing; it is rather in a stationary state; and it is only the natural surplus that is seeking for employment elsewhere. The pre-

liminary Report of the Census in April last conclusively proves this; for it shows that, so far from the population of the rural districts decreasing, it has increased by over 3 per cent. during the last decade; and, although this is much below the rate of increase in the town districts during the same period, it is satisfactory to note that it is considerably higher than what it was in the ten years between 1871 and 1881. Still, though such statements are exaggerated, they are relative to a real evil, and one which cannot but cause great anxiety. There is no doubt that farmers find it increasingly difficult to get labour, and that this difficulty is mainly due to the fact that among those who migrate from the country to the towns a large proportion is composed of the stronger and more energetic young men, who naturally would expect to find employment in the districts in which they have been brought up. Such a state of things in the present depressed state of agriculture is very serious; for, owing to foreign competition and other causes, agricultural products are already so heavily handicapped that, if additional obstacles are thrown in their way, there is a danger of the less fertile parts of the country going out of cultivation altogether. Nor is this a subject which concerns agriculture alone; but it is one of great national importance as well; for the concentration of large masses of our population in the principal towns cannot but have an injurious effect upon its general physique, owing to the less healthy conditions of life there. It is then as a contribution to the solution of this very difficult problem that the proposed measure is especially to be welcomed; for, although many causes contribute to the restlessness which leads so many of our agricultural labourers to seek for employment elsewhere—for instance, the greater facilities for travelling afforded by the extension of our railway communication, and the craving for increased interests and excitements engendered by the advance of education—one cause undoubtedly is the fact that the conditions of their life in the country do not provide sufficient objects or prospects of ambition. However industrious or capable an agricultural labourer may be, he is not likely,

*The Earl of Dudley*

under ordinary circumstances, to rise above the social grade in which he was born; and, as his wages are hardly more than sufficient for bare subsistence, he has nothing to look forward to in his old age but dependence on his friends, or on parochial relief. Such a state of things is naturally galling; and if by a measure of this kind a prospect is opened up to the better class of agricultural labourer of securing an independent and improved livelihood, an important step will have been taken towards keeping him attached to the soil. It may be objected, indeed, that if our large farmers, with all the advantages of capital and labour-saving machinery, find it difficult, even in the present state of things, to make ends meet, it will be doubly difficult for those who are without such advantages. But the fact must be taken into consideration that a man will bestow double the energy and patience on work that is done for his own immediate benefit that he will on that which he is paid to do for another; and it is possible that the wish to obtain that comfort and independence will supply a stimulus to extra exertion, such as will overcome the difficulties which he has to encounter. At any rate, there seems to be a wide-spread feeling amongst the agricultural classes themselves that such success is possible; and the good results that would ensue, if this prove to be the case, are sufficient justification for making an attempt in this direction—an attempt made the more easy because the large amount of land, easily available for purposes of such a kind, does away with the difficult subject of forced sale within the scope of its operation. In connection with this subject of labour, my Lords, there is a suggestion which, with all diffidence, I should like to make. Would it not be possible to utilize Irish labour for agricultural purposes more largely than is at present the case? In some parts of England, easily accessible from Ireland, a great proportion of farm work, during a part of the year, is done, and excellently well done, by Irish labourers, who cross the Channel for that purpose, and then return home again. Would it not be possible to extend this system more

widely, and, by means of agents in Holyhead or Dublin, to engage labour for those parts of the country where the need of it is most keenly felt? There is, I believe, a considerable amount of Irish labour available for such a purpose, much more than is at present made use of; and it might be worth while considering whether there are any insuperable obstacles in the way of supplying, in such a manner, at any rate some small portion of our present deficiency. My Lords, nothing remains for me now but to express to you my most sincere gratitude for the kind and patient way in which you have listened to me this afternoon. If I have not entered at greater length into some of the subjects dealt with in Her Majesty's Speech, my excuse must be that I have endeavoured to avoid wearying this House by a reiteration of matter already well known to your Lordships—indeed, some of the subjects need no comment to emphasize their importance. I now, my Lords, beg to move the Motion which stands in my name.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

*Most Gracious Sovereign,—*

We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

We take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the afflicting dispensation of Providence with which Your Majesty and this Nation has been visited in the death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

We assure your Majesty of our most heartfelt participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Your Majesty's family under this grievous affliction, and in the deep sense entertained by all classes of Your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which this Country has sustained by the loss of a Prince who had won for himself the general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."—(*The Earl of Dudley.*)

\*LORD LAMINGTON (who wore the uniform of the Lanarkshire Yeomanry) said: My Lords, on rising to second

the Address to the Throne, proposed by the noble Earl, I have to ask you to extend to me your utmost forbearance. I would first of all pray to be allowed to join the noble Lord in the tribute of homage which he has paid to the memory of a Prince who, by the blamelessness of his life and the pathos of his death, has established for himself a personality in the pages of English history, and a throne in every English heart. Born, as he was, in a position which gave him all the world for his critic, all posterity for his audience, it was a subject of deep thankfulness to the Nation that he should have so aptly learnt the lessons of life taught him by his illustrious parents, and, above all, that he should have responded so fully to those hopes and affections which Her Majesty has lately told us she had centred in him. Many may have thought that at such a moment any outward expression of their sympathy was almost an impertinence; but Her Majesty, in that gracious letter so full of womanly tenderness, has allayed all such fears by telling her faithful people how deeply she felt the throb of grief which stirred to its depths the heart of her Empire. My Lords, there is one figure supremely present in our national sorrow: that of the young Princess whom this month the Duke of Clarence would have made his wife. Upon sorrow such as hers we dare not intrude, except to assure her that the joy with which we regarded her betrothal is only equalled by the sympathy which we would offer her. My Lords, Her Majesty has given us in the Speech the satisfactory assurance that her relations with foreign Powers continue on the same friendly footing on which they have been established by Her Majesty's Government. As the noble Earl has well said, it is indeed a matter for congratulation that our policy abroad is directed by so masterly a hand, that not only have many difficulties been overcome, but no fresh complications have been permitted to arise. The death of Tewfik Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, a loyal ally of England and a faithful ruler of his people, is an event that we all deplore. Since his accession to power he had rendered to his country the inestimable benefits of the reduction of taxation, the protec-

tion of the fellaheen, and the development of its splendid natural resources. For these objects he had worked in the most perfect harmony with England, and there was, therefore, reasonable ground for anxiety lest his death should check the remarkable increase of prosperity which no observer has failed to recognize and appreciate. Happily, however, his son and successor Abbas has inaugurated his reign by declaring at the first meeting of the Legislative Council that his highest wish is to further the good work begun by his father. Not very long ago our neighbours across the Channel were encouraged to believe that our friendly interest in Egypt was about to cease; but the proposers of this course of action speedily ascertained that their suggestions were not acceptable, even to their own partizans, and now it is eminently satisfactory to note that at this moment the general consensus of opinion is practically unanimous in approving the views of Her Majesty's Government. When the French refused to co-operate in crushing the rebellion of Arabi they lost all claim to object to our remaining to assist in the regeneration of the country, as has been frankly owned to by French statesmen, and by M. Jules Ferry in particular. The interests of the Sultan of Turkey are alone materially concerned, and we have every reason to believe that His Imperial Highness not merely acquiesces in, but welcomes the continuance of our influence in Egypt, as both productive of unexampled benefit to the country and also as a safeguard to his own suzerainty. We have received with pleasure the intelligence that Zanzibar has taken its place amongst the free ports of the world. In all probability it will now attract to itself the bulk of the East African trade, and may rival in time to come even Singapore or Hong Kong as one of the great distributors of the world's commerce. My Lords, last Session I ventured to draw your attention to a more remote part of the world, the kingdom of Siam. My apprehensions then stated, if they have not been fully borne out by subsequent events (for I have not certain information on the point), have at least been recently justified by the declaration of M. Ribot, in

*Lord Lamington*

the French Chamber, that the French claimed all territory east of the Mekong River. It would take too long for me to discuss now these pretensions, so far as they affect the Siamese possessions on the lower portion of the Mekong; but I am anxious to point out, in all brevity, their importance with regard to the upper waters of that river. And please believe, my Lords, that I venture to do this, not in the slightest because I have personally visited this region, but because I know that the future of Indo-China is a matter of paramount interest to all Europeans there settled, and to many in our commercial circles at home. At present the eastern frontier of Burmah rests on the Mekong; but there is a small State adjacent, the greater part of which lies on the eastern or left bank of that river. That State, by our conquest in the last Burmese War, became by rights tributary to us, and the chief and his people are most desirous of coming under British suzerainty. But the Indian Government, with commendable caution, hesitated to extend their responsibility over a country distant by a journey of several weeks from their nearest post, and which, till just about this day last year, had never been visited by an European. But if we were to give this State the benefit of our protection (which in no way could be construed into an act of aggression) two material advantages would result. First of all, in place of having a river boundary, which is always liable to be a fruitful source of dissension, a chain of mountains, passable only at perhaps two points, would form the line of demarcation, excluding for the future any likely risk of trouble or friction. Secondly, our presence on the east bank of the Mekong would afford a moral support to the northern States of Siam. My Lords, I have put the case with extreme brevity, and, I fear, not very graphically; nor have I argued it in all its bearings; but I trust that by inviting your Lordships' attention to the matter, the Government may consider favourably the suggestion I have had the honour to submit. I would now remind your Lordships of the Indian Councils Bill, to which you will again be asked to give your approval.

As your Lordships will remember, this Bill proposes to give power to the Viceroy of India to increase the numbers of the Legislative and Provincial Councils, and also to regulate the conditions for the nomination of members to the Council; it proposes to give to the Legislative Council the right to discuss questions of finance which, at present, they only possess under special circumstances; and it further gives to the Council the privilege of interpellation to the Government of India, subject to the restraining authority of the Viceroy. It is to be earnestly hoped that this Session those who have the conduct of business in another place will take care that this measure becomes law, as it has been long and carefully considered by the Indian Government, who are most desirous that Her Majesty's Indian subjects should possess this gradual and judicious extension of responsibility. My Lords, may I say a few words with regard to our Colonial Empire? There has been a movement on foot to devise a representative system to connect the Colonies more closely with the Mother Country, and it is expected that a scheme for the common defence of the Empire may be evolved. Be that as it may, this movement in itself has proved that citizens at home, and citizens beyond the seas, are united by the strongest ties of sympathy, and, as Anglo-Saxons, are proud of belonging to the nation that has carried civilization to the uttermost ends of the earth. Without such a patriotic feeling any mere artificial enactment would be worthless, and for this reason we hail with peculiar pleasure the emphatic testimony recently borne by our Australian kinsmen to the policy of Her Majesty's present Ministry, as having been most conciliatory and eminently calculated to develop our common hopes and interests. Turning our attention homewards, I would act on the friendly suggestion of the noble Earl, and invite your attention to a measure dealing with Scotch Private Bill procedure. It is generally agreed now-a-days that it is desirable to decentralize, so far as is consistent with efficiency; and this not only for the convenience of those immediately concerned, but because

the devolution of business tends to strengthen local ties and national associations, and thus checks the gravitation of all interests to the Metropolis. We may assume that special difficulties connected with this measure have been overcome. One difficulty lay in the composition of the body who were to be selected to adjudicate; and, secondly, although in the promotion of minor Bills, such as those connected with water and gas, there would have been a great reduction of cost, yet it was thought that the promotion of Railway Bills would have led to a heavier expenditure than is even now the case. As the Scottish people are eagerly awaiting the passing of this measure, it is to be hoped that there will be no further delay in its becoming the law of the land. This Bill will apply equally to Ireland, and with the two proposed measures for Local Government and Education, on which the noble Earl has dwelt so ably and exhaustively, is an earnest that Her Majesty's Government hope to give to Ireland the promised legislative privileges identical, so far as circumstances will permit, with those which England and Scotland already enjoy. But it is to be remarked that it is the peaceable state of Ireland that entitles her to this extension of control in the management of her own local affairs. We cannot credit the present tranquil aspect of the country (so vast a change from the chaos of a few years ago) to the unrealised hopes of the divided Irish Party, who were wont to attribute any improvement in the condition of Ireland to the near prospect of the separation of her Parliament from that of Great Britain. Surely, my Lords, the real cause of the bright aspect which Ireland now bears is that whilst every effort has been made to ameliorate and raise the condition of her peasantry, the dignity and impartiality of the law has been unhesitatingly upheld by the statesman to whose tenure of office Ireland will ever look back with gratitude and pride. I am certain that there are no people more capable of developing a spirit of loyalty when their ignorance is not traded on by unscrupulous agitation, and when they are freed from the terrorism which one of our greatest

living politicians has said can only exist by the sanction of murder. My Lords, we are told that the phantom of Home Rule will again assume a corporeal existence, and will one day knock at the doors of this House. Woe unutterable is predicted should your Lordships then bar its progress to the steps of the Throne. I am confident that your Lordships will never refuse to listen to the wish of the people when calmly determined and clearly delivered. But, unless you were convinced that this wish were universal and genuine, you would only be fulfilling the trust reposed in you by refusing to make law a measure that you deemed destructive. Should it then please those in another place to pass Resolutions threatening the existence of this House, no objection I imagine would be raised here to them thus harmlessly disposing of their time. My Lords, the proposals mentioned in Her Majesty's Speech having particular reference to England,—such as the completion of the Local Government Act, the relieving of the Elementary Public Schools from the pressure of local rates, and the proposal to give powers for strengthening authority in the Church of England—are all of them proposals likely to meet with your Lordships' approval. But in this, the last decade of the century, many questions are raised which involve, or would involve, great changes in the social economy of Great Britain. We are expressly bidden by Her Majesty to consider a measure for increasing the number of small holdings. The main principle of the Bill will be to empower the Local Authorities to advance money to the would-be purchasers of these holdings. It is thought that thus the labourer who has put by some money would be enabled to indulge in the very natural desire of acquiring some of the land—and the foundations of a peasant proprietary would be established. This marks another instance of the sympathy of Her Majesty's Government with the agricultural population. It must not be assumed that the proposed measure will solve the problem of the crowding of people from the rural districts into towns; nor would it be wise to interfere sharply with the working of the natural laws of supply and demand. At the present

*Lord Lamington*

time the high scale of wages in our towns, mining districts, and colonies attracts the country population; but if this movement were to be entirely arrested, it would necessarily follow that the increased facilities of commanding agricultural labour would mean the reduction of agricultural wages, which we are told are already too low; whilst the proportionate rise in the scale of wages in the towns would increase the difficulties of competing with the foreign manufacturers. Even in my own recollection, near to where I live, I have known whole villages abandoned, with the result, of course, of largely increased wages to those who remain. But it has often seemed to me that a complex yet natural process is at work, by which a proportion of the rural population drifts into the towns, where they profit by the blessing of our great principle of Free Trade, and thus, in due course of time, reappear in the country in the character of feu or villa holders. This Bill, therefore, without revolutionizing the existing order of things, will multiply the number of those who have a personal and permanent stake in the country. It is satisfactory that compulsory purchase is not contemplated, for, as the noble Earl has said, there is plenty of land in the market of every quality and quantity; and it is to be hoped also that purchasers under this Bill will be restricted to those who are *bona fide* workers of the soil. My Lords, the Government are right to approach this and kindred subjects, such as the general question of labour, in a tentative and inquiring spirit. The best manner for arriving at sound conclusions is for an Administration, by keeping its finger on the pulse of the people, to ascertain their aims and impulses, and then to try and formulate the ideas that have been broached. The most fruitful seed will be that which the Government plants in a soil that has been turned and re-turned by its people. My Lords, Her Majesty's Ministers have now for nearly six years laboured to fulfil the responsibilities of their offices, and they have their full reward in the humble belief that Her Majesty appreciates their efforts to maintain the dignity of her Empire, and to foster the welfare of all

er subjects. Therefore, in seconding the Motion for the Address, I am confident that your Lordships will respond fully and loyally to the Royal Message, which Her Majesty has to-day conveyed to her faithful Parliament.

\*THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, before touching upon some of the points raised by Her Majesty's gracious Speech, I have a very agreeable duty to perform, namely, to express, what I am sure is the general sense of the House, the pleasure and satisfaction at the way in which the Mover and Second of the Address have discharged their duties, and especially I must say that, in common I know with many on this side of the House, we heard with the greatest pleasure the speech of the noble Earl the proposer—a speech characterised, I may venture to say, with unusual ability, when speeches are made on an occasion of this kind. And personally, the noble Earl will allow me to say that, having been an old friend of his father, I welcome his taking part in the debates of this House, and trust that he will become a very useful and constant attendant on our business. With regard to the noble Lord who seconded the Address, we have all had the pleasure before of hearing him speak in this House, and we know that he is perfectly able to do his own, and promises to be a very useful Member of it. My Lords, I have now to turn to a very different topic; one which was admirably dealt with by the proposer of the Address—I mean the melancholy and calamitous event which is the subject of the first paragraph of Her Majesty's Speech. My Lords, the feeling towards the Queen, one of unabated loyalty, and perhaps I may be allowed to say of affectionate regard on the part of all her people, is such that it would always secure that, in any calamitous event occurring to the Royal Family, the deepest sympathy would be felt with Her Majesty and with Her Majesty's family. But as the noble Earl moving the Address observed, no circumstance was wanting in this sad event to give it the most tragic colour. My Lords, the young Prince, whose loss we deplore, was the eldest son of the heir Apparent to the Throne, with the brightest prospects before him in life,

and upon the very eve of contracting what doubtless would have proved a most happy marriage. Such an event, even in private life, must have evoked the widest sympathy; but happening, as it does, to one placed in so conspicuous a situation, and connected with the family towards whom we feel so strongly in affection and respect, it has evoked the universal sympathy of the whole British Empire. My Lords, those who have had the honour of an acquaintance, however slight, with the late Duke of Clarence and Avondale, must have observed what a gentle and kindly disposition he possessed; and those who have heard him, upon the few occasions when he appeared before the public, must have seen that he showed distinct promise of qualities which would certainly have enabled him to discharge afterwards the duties of his high position with efficiency, with satisfaction to himself, and with benefit to the country over which, perhaps, he would have eventually been the Sovereign. My Lords, in such circumstances as these no consolation which we can offer can, I fear, have much effect; but I am certain that, as throughout the Empire, so in this House, there is the deepest feeling of sympathy towards Her Majesty the Queen, sympathy with the afflicted parents of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and with the Princess whose hopes were so cruelly blighted by this terrible calamity. My Lords, I turn now to the matters of business dealt with in this Speech. I entirely concur with the noble Lords in the satisfaction which we all must feel in hearing that our relations are of friendly nature with all Foreign Powers. My Lords, there is an allusion which is most fitly made in the Speech to the loss which has been sustained, and which we especially have sustained by the death of the Khedive of Egypt. The Khedive was a ruler who, by his simple and blameless life, by his great regard for the interests of the people over whom he ruled, and by his singular freedom from intrigue, and his straightforwardness in his dealings with all Powers with whom he had to do, commanded general respect; and his loss is one which will be very widely lamented. With regard to the future,



the noble Lord who seconded the Address entered somewhat largely into the Egyptian question. I do not think this would be a wise opportunity to raise a controversy on this subject. Just at this moment, when there is a change in the ruler of that country, the moment clearly would not be well chosen for expressing the opinions, whatever they may be, which we hold upon this subject. At the same time, I must not be held to acquiesce in all, or indeed in much, that the noble Lord the Seconder of the Address said on this subject. My feeling is this: I agree with the paragraph of the Speech in the hope that the new Khedive will follow in the steps of his predecessor, and I trust that he will, by a sagacious conduct of the administration of Egypt, secure—what I believe is wished, not only by ourselves, but by all the Powers interested in Egypt—that that country should be placed in such a position that its Government should have a firm basis, and that it should be able to sustain itself alone, without foreign assistance. And, for my part, I do not believe that there are any in this country who do not look forward to the time when we shall be able, in accordance with our obligations, which have been acknowledged by all parties, to terminate the occupation of Egypt, which has been productive of much benefit I am sure, and of great blessings to that country, but the long continuance of which, I believe, is fraught with great disadvantages to our own country. My Lords, I notice an omission in the Speech, which I regret, namely, that there is no mention of Newfoundland. I had hoped that possibly the exertions of Her Majesty's Government might have been crowned with success, and that we might have heard that large progress had been made in settling that continued difficulty; but I am afraid that the fates are against us as usual in this matter, and that Her Majesty's Government will bequeath what I may term a sort of Chancery suit of diplomacy to their successors, whoever they may be. As to the Behring Straits matter, all of us must have seen with great satisfaction that an agreement had been come to with the United States, and

*Earl of Kimberley*

that the matter is to be dealt with by arbitration. Now, my Lords, I turn to matters of domestic interest, and I am not surprised to find that in the forefront is placed the promise of a measure of Local Government for Ireland. I am not surprised, because, no doubt, Her Majesty's Government have always announced that they would extend to Ireland the same, or some similar measure of local government as that which has been given in England. But whether that satisfaction with which we view the introduction of such a measure will be equally shared by those who support the noble Marquess, I cannot help feeling some doubt. If the measure is one which is a real measure of local government, and which is not fenced with those guarantees and securities, to which one of the noble Lords alluded, in so elaborate a manner as to render it practically a sham; if, I say, it is a real measure of local government, it will be welcomed with pleasure on this side of the House, not only on account of the advantages which we believe there would be in the improvement of the local government of Ireland, which all know to be exceedingly defective, but also we take a view (which I do not think is so generally shared, or if it is felt on the other side cannot be felt with very great pleasure) that nothing is more likely to further that Home Rule which is a portion of our policy than the constitution of this local government in Ireland. Therefore, in any event, we view it with satisfaction. We hope the measure will pass. We believe that one of two things will happen: either that it will be a satisfactory measure and will, so far as it goes, strengthen our policy in Ireland, or, if it should turn out to be a measure which has very little real substance in it, it will be likely to increase dissatisfaction in Ireland, and, in that way also, to further the policy which we have at heart. Now, there is another matter which the noble Lords justly alluded to as one of great importance, and one which does not bear quite so much a Party character as the one which I have been referring to: I mean the measure dealing with Irish education. Irish education, all who know that country know, is not now in

a satisfactory position. There was a time when the system of education in Ireland was somewhat in advance of the system in England; but since that time we have made great progress. No one can doubt that some reform is required in the educational system in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government have, no doubt, been compelled to address themselves to the subject because there is a sum of money which has to be distributed in Ireland, which I believe at present remains in the hands of the Treasury, if I am rightly informed. But I observe there is this difference between Ireland and England in this matter: we were always of opinion, I believe on both sides of the House, that one of the chief reasons why it was desirable to give what is called free or assisted education (I do not quarrel about the word) in England and Scotland was that we had compulsory education in England and Scotland, and that, therefore, it was reasonable that those who were compelled to send their children to school should not have to pay a fee for sending them there—but hitherto education has never been compulsory in Ireland, and I shall be extremely anxious to see whether Her Majesty's Government intend to introduce the compulsory system into that country. But I cannot congratulate the Government, in one sense, for having that measure in hand; for I think they will find it is about one of the most thorny subjects they can have to deal with in that country; and I shall be exceedingly curious to see whether the loyalty of some of the hot Orangemen in Ireland will stand the test of accepting a measure which would compel them to send their children to schools very largely attended by children of their Roman Catholic countrymen. But, while I say this, I wish well to the measure because of its educational advantages, and because I think anything that brings together the different sections of the population of Ireland must be a benefit to the whole Empire. So much with regard to Irish measures, which I should think are likely to occupy a very considerable part of this Session. But we are also promised a very important English measure, I mean

that for small holdings. I will not trouble your Lordships with a discussion on the depopulation of the rural districts. The only remark I would make is this: that this movement of the rural population to the towns is in no way peculiar to this country. It is in the most remarkable manner a movement going on all over the world. It is found in France; it is found in Canada, where the towns have increased much faster than the rural districts; it is found in the United States, where the increase in the towns is infinitely greater than it is in the rural districts; it is found in Australia, where the circumstances are wholly different; therefore, I think we must dismiss from our minds the idea that any particular system of land tenure, or any particular system of society, such as we have here, is the main and principal cause of this movement. I say that, because I think otherwise we may be led astray in considering these questions. But when I make this general observation, I by no means wish to depreciate any attempts which may be made to diminish the strength of this movement. On the contrary, I think the universality of the movement and the strength of it render it the more necessary that we should take any measure that may be in our power to counteract it. It is the interest of the country, it is the interest of the whole population, that the rural population should not be unduly diminished; and although one of the noble Lords said that the Census showed that there was not a diminution in our rural districts, I cannot help feeling some doubt as to whether that conclusion is well founded. It may be that, taking all so-called rural districts together, there may not be generally a diminution; but if you look at the strictly rural agricultural districts, I think you will find that there is a diminution going on, although not in so great a proportion as in the previous decade. However that may be, this is a measure that must be judged, not merely with reference to the question of depopulation, but with reference to many other aspects which it bears. What I am rather curious to know is, what is the precise object which Her Majesty's Government will have in view with

regard to this measure? My reason for saying so is this: the noble Marquess will forgive me for referring to a very interesting speech which he recently made, and in which he discussed very largely this question of small holdings. I was rather puzzled to know what were the precise objects which the Government had in view in proposing such a measure. The question of the improvement of the condition of the labourers by any such measure was set aside by the noble Marquess. He laid great stress upon what I am by no means disposed to underrate—the political effects of increasing the number of proprietors in this country; but the chief, the main, object, apparently, which he had in view in the creation of these small holdings was one that I confess surprised me, namely, the diminution of the pressure of the poor rates on real property; and if that is the chief object of the measure I doubt very much whether it will be received with quite as much satisfaction in the rural districts as the noble Marquess may desire. But there is one observation I wish to make upon this Small Holdings Bill: that I think it is a very striking refutation of the attacks which have been made upon those who sit upon this side of the Table, or in the other House of Parliament, for our supposed, as it is called, bidding for the agricultural vote. We are constantly told that we are exceedingly factious people—that our only object is to catch a vote here and there, and that we have been bidding for the agricultural vote. Well, I apprehend that all parties are very desirous to obtain the agricultural vote if they can, and I think that this Bill that has been brought forward by the Government is a very strong example that bidding for the agricultural vote is not confined to this side of the House. And I must also make this remark—that we have lately seen what is exceedingly gratifying to us, because it is a very old saying that nothing is so flattering as imitation. Now we had a conference in London of agricultural labourers, and, I believe, in some quarters among those who are opposed to us there was a disposition rather to underrate and sneer at the conference.

*The Earl of Kimberley*

But, what took place soon after? The Minister for Agriculture paid us the great compliment of instantly imitating what we had done, and setting up another and rival conference of agricultural labourers in a district not very far from me. I am sufficiently vain to think that the copy was not as good as the original; but, at all events, it shows that we have no monopoly of this attempt to catch the agricultural vote; and all that we can hope for is that we may have a majority of their votes. And I am not quite certain that this small holdings measure may not really be ascribed a good deal to the pressure which has been brought forward on the part of the Opposition for something to be done for the agricultural labourer, and that we may not get possibly a certain amount of the credit that may be derived from this measure. But, be that as it may, I think the matter must really be judged, not from a Party point of view of who is going to get votes at the next election. The measure is one of very considerable importance and, when it comes (as I trust it will) before the House, it will meet on both sides of it with a fair disposition to favourable consideration, if it is a reasonable measure. Now there is a measure which interests me personally and many noble Lords in this House, which I am very glad to see mentioned in the Speech—I mean the measure which is described as for the improvement of the Legislative Councils of India. I echo most sincerely a hope which was expressed by one of the noble Lords who moved and seconded the Address, that this measure will not merely pass through this House, but will be pressed by Her Majesty's Government through the other House and will pass into law. It is really a misfortune that a measure of this kind should be hung up Session after Session. However important to us may be our domestic legislation, let us not forget that we have an immense responsibility in the government of that great Empire in India, and that it is not well for us to palter long with questions of this kind. And I am the more desirous that this measure should be dealt with, because I have observed, as I have no doubt the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India

has observed, with great pleasure that in India the tone has much moderated in dealing with this subject, and that very sensible views have been expressed at meetings held in India; and there is now a reasonable promise that there will be an agreement as to a tentative and commencing measure upon this subject. We must not look for it all at once; but if we can make a beginning, I believe we shall lay the foundation for what may be a real benefit and a real security to our Indian Empire. My Lords, there are a number of other small matters that are dealt with in the Speech, and upon which, if I were disposed to occupy your time, I might make some observations. But you know that every Session we have what may be called the ghosts of the previous Session resuscitated and brought before us; and here they are as usual. My own feeling is that, whilst they are very interesting figures, at this time of day, when this Parliament is necessarily not far from its termination, it will not be found that there will be any very extraordinary anxiety to deal with those subjects which are not of great and pressing interest, and that, in all probability, some at least, perhaps all of them, will survive to appear in another Parliament, and receive then I hope more attention than they would probably get in the present Parliament. My Lords, I will not detain your Lordships any longer. The Speech has the great merit of brevity; the subjects of it are plainly and sufficiently stated; and I daresay your Lordships will be very glad if I say that I have exhausted all the observations that I wish to make on this occasion.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (The Marquess of SALISBURY): In the course of his, I am bound to say very temperate, remarks, or rather at the beginning of them, the noble Lord commenced with that tribute to the talent of those who have moved and seconded the Address, which was never more fitly delivered than on the present occasion. At all events, tonight we can say that, in reiterating that eulogy, we are using no hollow and unreal phraseology. The speeches of the two noble Lords, and especially of

the noble Earl who moved the Address, will take a very high rank among similar addresses which we have listened to in this House. They indicate great powers of mind and of speech; and if the two noble Lords will give us the benefit in future debates of the powers that they have displayed, there will be a very considerable addition, both of solid thought and of graceful language, to illustrate the discussions of this House. My Lords, we meet on a very sad and tragic occasion, which must necessarily colour our remarks, and I think probably diminish the keenness of our application to other subjects. I do not feel that, after the very pathetic and eloquent observations which have fallen from all who have noticed this sad subject, I ought to detain your Lordships long by dwelling upon it; it is one which must waken our deepest feelings of sympathy as individuals, and loyalty as good subjects. We, most of us, had some acquaintance—my own was very slight, but I had some acquaintance—with the lamented Prince whose loss we are deploring. It always struck me that I had seldom seen in any rank, and hardly ever in so exalted a rank, such a perfect absence of selfishness or pride of any kind, such a complete amiability of character, such a desire to make himself loved by all with whom he might come in contact; and I think that, outside the circle of those who knew him, the recognition of his fine qualities was widely spread, and it was believed that in a future, though all hoped a distant, day we had the hope of a ruler who would carry on at their highest level the traditions of the English Monarchy. And then the depth of the calamity is measured by the contrast of the feelings against which it is thrown. Before this event took place a marriage had been announced which had been singularly grateful to the feelings of the people of this country. It was a marriage with a Princess well known and universally beloved, and universally honoured wherever she was known, and men looked forward with an enthusiasm to that event which they could not feel in the case of a Princess coming from another land with whom they had not yet been able to make themselves

acquainted. The tragic character of the reality is thrown out by its contrast with the hopefulness of those dreams in which men indulged. The considerations of consolation, on which the noble Earl behind me has dwelt, have no doubt weighed strongly with your Lordships, as they have weighed with the August Sovereign whose words this Speech embodies. It is no small thing to feel that the position, the action, the common reputation of the Royal Family, and especially of the Sovereign who is at the head of it, are such as to have called forth, even from those who knew little or nothing of the Prince we have lost, that universal unbidden outburst of sympathy and sorrow which echoed from every corner of the world. It shows to us that, above all theories, our institutions are knit together by human and personal feelings, and that their popularity is largely a tribute to, and a proof of, the excellence of those who bear the honours they confer. My Lords, as I have said, the observations of the noble Lord opposite were very temperate, and I do not know, if equity did not demand it, that I should think it necessary to answer him in the matters to which he referred. He told us that he disagreed about Egypt; but, by way of showing that he disagreed, he proceeded to utter what, so far as I could catch it, was a very sound and orthodox statement of the view which has always been held on both sides of the House.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I only said that I disagreed with some things that the Seconder had said.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We have always held language which, as I say, speaking merely from what I gathered, is very similar to that which has been held this evening by the noble Lord.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: That I can quite understand.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We have great confidence that the experiment—the somewhat strange and anomalous experiment—in which this country has taken so large a part, will not be allowed to fail. Our object is, undoubtedly, that Egypt should stand by her own strength—too strong either for internal intrigue or rebellion or for external encroachment to overthrow.

*The Marquess of Salisbury*

That is the object we have in view. We may think that our critics imagine that that object can be reached more rapidly, and by more royal roads, than we believe to be the case. That is a matter which, I agree with the noble Lord, we had better defer to some other opportunity of debate. But the difference between us is a difference in means, and not in ends; and I earnestly hope that no foreign country will believe that this people, after all they have sacrificed, and all they have done, will ever abandon Egypt, either to the supremacy of any other Power, or to the destruction of disorder and anarchy within. The noble Lord asked us about Newfoundland. He very fitly compared it to a Chancery suit—even under the reformed orders of the Court of Chancery; but he proceeded to say that he hoped the efforts of Her Majesty's Government had procured a settlement of it. Well, if Her Majesty's Government had been left alone, we should have procured a settlement of it. The efforts of Her Majesty's Government bore the very fairest promise of success. Unfortunately, a Bill was necessary, and that Bill had to pass through both Houses of Parliament. In this House it met with a certain amount of criticism; but the noble Lords opposite did their roaring very gently, and I do not think any very great harm was done. But when it got into the other House of Parliament the matter took a very different turn, and I am revealing no diplomatic secret, for whenever the Papers come to be published it must appear that the observations which were made by gentlemen, who believed themselves to be, and announced themselves to be, on the point of coming into Office at an early period, were of such a character as entirely to destroy in the French Government any hope that they would obtain the execution of the decrees of the arbitrator, whenever the arbitrator might be appointed; and the result is that since those speeches have been delivered we have not moved a single inch, and the French Government have not, up to this time, ventured to submit, or thought it right to submit, to their Chamber the ratification of the engagement on the strength of which we proposed that

Bill to Parliament. I am justified, therefore, in saying that if the Newfoundland business has not got further than it has at present, it is not because we have made no efforts, but because our efforts have been interfered with by the somewhat rash criticisms that others have devoted to them. But it is fair to say that the French Government are, I believe, awaiting the result of legislation which has been promised in the Newfoundland Assembly. I do not venture to prophesy what its fate will be; but, until that fate is decided, I am wholly unable to tell the noble Lord how soon the Chancery suit will come to a conclusion. The noble Lord derived great consolation from the consideration of Irish affairs. He thought he saw the material for failure and consequent discontent in all the measures of Her Majesty's Government, and he exulted in the notion that we should produce so much dissatisfaction in Ireland that the success of his Party would consequently be the result. Well, that is, perhaps, not a novel way of looking at the legislative proposals of your opponent. What is novel is the extreme candour with which, on this occasion, it has been announced. I can only say that I hope the noble Lord will be disappointed. I quite admit with him that education is a very thorny subject, and I have no doubt we shall find that we have stirred up a considerable hornet's nest in some direction or other by any proposals that we may make; but if we are to be deterred from doing anything for education in Ireland by that reflection, when we consider how deeply education goes to the root of all the differences by which that country is distracted, I imagine our legislative career would be of a very anodyne and unimportant character. The noble Lord expressed his curiosity as to what several Bills would contain. I think, on the whole, I had better leave him to the sufferings which that unsatisfied passion may cause him a few days longer. If I were to attempt to give him an account from memory of the various clauses he has referred to, I might possibly make some mistake for which he would be very angry with me afterwards. I can only hope that his rest will not be seriously compromised by the length of

time he will have to wait. The matter which, I think, excited the noble Lord to the greatest extent was our proposal for a Small Holdings Bill. He was indignant that we had tried to catch the agricultural vote.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: No; I made no objection. I objected that we were accused of doing it when you were doing the same thing.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I imagine we used to be called the Agricultural Party, and it sounds rather as if I were trying to catch my own vote—an effort I should find no difficulty in performing. But I do not think there is much reality in an accusation, under our Constitutional Government, of what is called trying to catch votes, unless you do it in a dishonourable manner, and in a manner inconsistent with your own convictions; because I understand these two Houses sit rather for the purpose of listening to the grievances and views of the inhabitants of this country, and that, if they do not try to catch votes—that is to say, if they do not try to meet the wishes of the people by whom this country is inhabited—they very largely fail in the duties which they have to perform. But the noble Lord seemed to suggest that we had borrowed our policy from him. That is a claim of copyright which I hear constantly coming from the benches opposite. It appears to me that at some time or other some versatile Member or other of their Party has made every possible suggestion on political matters which human ingenuity can contrive; and, therefore, it consequently follows that if anybody takes up any idea in earnest he must find that some Member of the Liberal Party at some time or other had expressed a similar idea. I venture to say for myself that I am not guilty of borrowing from the noble Lord in this matter of small holdings. The noble Lord must remember perfectly well—it is some time ago now—that when he was pushing the first Irish Bill through Parliament I ventured to support him, very much to the indignation of my then leader, the noble Duke behind me (the Duke of Richmond), in the policy of those small holdings. I was a believer in the policy that the Bright Clauses suggested. They were not very

successful; they failed to please the Treasury—a failure which has happened to other clauses besides those—and consequently they did not succeed. But they represented a principle which I ventured to support then, and which I support now, as most essentially Conservative in its nature. There is no guarantee for the maintenance of the institutions of a country like a large number of possessors of land in that country. I do not say that these small holdings will be able to effect that object; the economical causes may be too strong for us; it may not be possible to cultivate land in these small parcels with success, or to own it with success; the temptation to invest the capital in something more remunerative may tend to cause the constant sale of the holdings as fast as they are created. I am putting the matter in its worst light. I do not in the least pledge my own belief that this must necessarily succeed over a very large portion of the country. I believe in some portions of the country, where the soil is fertile, it may succeed. I am quite certain that wherever it does succeed it will be a very large additional guarantee to the institutions of this country. And I must correct a misunderstanding of the noble Lord's with respect to the object that I have in view. That guarantee to the institutions of the country is what induced me 20 years ago, and what induces me now, and I believe always will induce me, to support a policy for multiplying the owners of land. When I said that it would end in diminishing the burden of the poor rates, what I thought I explained at Exeter (but I am afraid I did not carry it to the mind of the noble Lord), was that it seemed to me that rates generally, education rates certainly, were levied upon the land, and not levied upon other sources of income, and that, by that undue preference given to personal property, a very considerable injustice was being committed. My belief was that if we had a large number of small holders through the country we should be electorally too strong to allow that injustice to continue; but it is only in that sense that I thought the multiplication of small holders would diminish the burden of the poor rates. My Lords, I do not care to dwell upon

*The Marquess of Salisbury*

this subject, for I think we had much better do so when the measure is before us. I feel a difficulty in dealing with this measure, and, indeed, with many other measures which we recommend, either in the Queen's Speech or at other times, in that I am no believer in nostrums or panaceas. I think great evil is done by exaggerating the benefit that any one measure can confer upon the people of this country. The action of every measure must be very limited and partial, and the good that it can produce can only be produced gradually; and I am afraid we shall generate a disbelief in the efficiency of Parliament, and a disbelief in the sincerity of politicians, if we prophecy too large a result from any measure of this kind. But, subject always to that consideration, I do not think there is any object to which we can direct our efforts which would produce more certain hope of benefit than that of multiplying the owners of the land. I do not say this as believing that it will have a very great effect, or a very extensive effect, in retaining in the country those who are not owners of the land. The noble Lord very justly says that the gravitation towards the towns is a thing confined to no country. It is a mark of our time. I believe it is largely the result of education; it is largely the result of that widening of ideas which makes men more anxious for the converse of each other; and men therefore shrink from the isolation and dulness of the country, and love the excitement of the towns. And against that strong human instinct you will struggle in vain. I believe we must confine ourselves to efforts in which we can hope to succeed. If we are able to give the widest scope to the abilities of the dwellers in the country as well as the dwellers in the town; if we are able to elevate their morality and to instruct their minds, so as to stimulate their exertions to the highest extent; if we can hold out to them an object of ambition, which leads to the strongest efforts on the part of the cleverest men, we may be sure that, whether we catch the agricultural vote or not, whatever the immediate and temporary effect of our legislation should be, we are contributing powerfully to the maintenance of our institu-

and the permanent welfare of our  
y.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE:  
Lords, I do not think it is  
ary that I should venture to  
ss upon your Lordships' atten-  
y any remarks upon any of the  
ts referred to in Her Majesty's  
ous Speech from the Throne, save  
But I do desire, at the request  
noble Friend who sits beside me  
(Earl of Derby), who has hitherto  
ably represented the opinions,  
een the exponent of the opinions,  
arge number of Members of your  
hips' House, to say one or two  
to express how entirely we con-

1 all that has fallen from the  
Lords who have moved and  
led the Address to the Throne,  
he Prime Minister, and the noble  
who sits near me, upon the great  
ity which has recently befallen the  
Family. It is impossible for me to  
much or anything to what has al-  
been said. When a life of great  
se, a life which appeared to offer  
irest prospect that could be open  
noblest ambition, is suddenly and  
sturely cut short, it must, under  
rcumstances, become the subject  
versal interest and universal sym-  
. But the young Prince whose  
ve deplore did not stand alone,  
t is rather with his illustrious  
ts and relatives than with himself  
ur thoughts are chiefly concerned  
7. It is well-known that the nu-  
is heavy cares of duty which  
y the attention of Her Majesty  
in no degree distracted her atten-  
com her domestic duties or chilled  
omestic affections. We know still  
r that the comparative isolation  
e Throne has perhaps rendered  
feelings of affection more acute  
ore intense than is the case with  
ry individuals. The Prince and  
ess of Wales have so identified  
elves with the life of the people,  
midst of whom they occupy the  
exalted position: they have so  
l our joys and our sorrows,  
entered into our labours and  
cupations: that we everyone of  
el an interest in everything  
1 concerns and touches them;  
nothing which can affect their  
ness and their interest can be

indifferent to us. My Lords, if conso-  
lation could be found for such a crush-  
ing and heavy blow as has befallen the  
Prince and Princess of Wales, it would,  
as has already been said, be found in  
the spontaneous and sincere effusion of  
respectful sympathy which has pro-  
ceeded from every part of the Empire.  
We cannot hope that as yet even here  
much consolation can be found. As  
has been well expressed by a dis-  
tinguished Member of your Lordships'  
House: "That a world-wide Empire  
mourns with them were slender  
solace;" but it is all that we can offer,  
and we do offer it, as the tribute of  
sincere and loyal hearts.

Address agreed to, *nemine dissente*,  
and ordered to be presented to Her  
Majesty by the Lords with White  
Staves.

#### CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The EARL of MORLEY appointed,  
*nemine dissente*, to take the Chair  
in all Committees of this House for  
this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES—Ap-  
pointed.

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS  
—Appointed.

STOPPAGES IN THE STREETS—Orders  
to prevent, renewed.

APPEAL COMMITTEE—Appointed.

#### SELECT VESTRIES.

Bill, *pro forma*, read 1<sup>a</sup>.

#### INDIAN COUNCILS ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Indian Councils Act,  
1861, was presented by the Viscount Cross;  
read 1<sup>a</sup>; to be printed; and to be read 2<sup>a</sup> on  
Monday next. (No. 3.)

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Law of Evidence—Was  
presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1<sup>a</sup>;  
and to be printed. (No. 4.)

#### ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Law as to the endow-  
ment of the Archdeaconry of Cornwall—Was  
presented by the Lord Steward (E. Mount-  
Edgecumbe); read 1<sup>a</sup>: and to be printed.  
(No. 5.)

House adjourned at a quarter past  
Six o'clock, to Thursday next at a  
quarter past Ten o'clock.



## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday, 9th February, 1892.*

The House met at half after one of the clock.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners ;—

The House met ;—and being returned ;—

## NEW WRITS DURING THE RECESS.

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had issued during the Recess Warrants for New Writs :— For Lewisham, *v.* the Right Hon. Viscount Lewisham, called to the House of Peers as Earl of Dartmouth ; for Cambridge University, *v.* the Right Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes, deceased ; for Manchester (N.E. Division), *v.* the Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, Bart., Postmaster General ; for Bute, *v.* the Right Hon. J. P. B. Robertson, now Lord Justice General of Scotland ; for the Borough of Strand, *v.* the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, deceased ; for the County of Kilkenny (Northern Division), *v.* Sir John Pope Hennessy, deceased ; for the County of Devon (South Molton Division), *v.* Viscount Lynton, called to the House of Peers as Earl of Portsmouth ; for Cork City, *v.* Mr. C. S. Parnell, deceased ; for Leeds (Northern Division), *v.* the Right Hon. W. L. Jackson, Chief Secretary for Ireland ; for Dorset (Eastern Division), *v.* Mr. G. H. Bond, deceased ; for Sussex (South-Western or Chichester Division), *v.* Lord Walter Gordon Lennox, Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household ; for the County of Armagh (Mid Division), *v.* Sir James Porter Corry, Bart., deceased ; for the City of Waterford, *v.* Mr. Richard Power, deceased ; for the County of Lancaster (Rossendale Division), *v.* the Right Hon. the Marquess of Hartington, called to the House of Peers as the Duke of Devonshire.

## ELECTIONS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their election for which of the places they will serve, within

one week after it shall appear that there is a question upon the return for that place ; and if anything shall come in question touching the return or election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate ; and that all Members returned upon double returns do withdraw until their returns are determined.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

Resolved, That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any other, be proposed to be elected ; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by bribery or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such bribery or other corrupt practices.

## WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to defer or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime and misdemeanour ; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee, thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

## METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts ; and that

the Sergeant-at-Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

#### VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

#### PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

#### OUTLAWRIES BILL.

Bill "for the more effectual preventing clandestine outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### JOURNAL.

Ordered, That the Journal of this House from the end of the last Session to the end of the present Session, with an Index to the 147th Volume, be printed.

Ordered, That 750 copies of the said Journal be printed by the appointment and under the direction of Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave Esq., C.B., the Clerk of this House.

Ordered, That the said Journal and Index be printed by such Person as shall be licensed by Mr. Speaker, and that no other person do presume to print the same.

#### MAIL CONTRACT, PORTSMOUTH AND RYDE.

Copy ordered—

Of the contracts with the London and South-Western Railway Company and the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company, dated 10th November, 1891, for the conveyance of mails between Portsmouth and Ryde, together with the Treasury Minute relating thereto.—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 1.)

#### CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1890-91.

Copy ordered—

Of accounts showing—

1. The Receipts and Payments in connection with the Fund in the year ended 31st March, 1891.

2. The distribution of the capital of the Fund at the commencement and close of the year.

Together with the correspondence with the Controller and Auditor-General thereon.—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 2.)

#### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

Copy ordered—

Of Account of the Receipts and Payments of the Accountant-General of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland, in respect of the Funds of Suitors in the said Court, in the year to the 30th day of September, 1891; together with a statement of liabilities and assets, and particulars of securities in Court on 30th day of September, 1891.—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 3.)

#### NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

Right Hon. W. L. Jackson, for Leeds, N.; Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, bart., for Manchester, N.E.; Mr. Graham Murray, for Bute; Right Hon. Lord W. G. Lennox, for Sussex, Chichester Division; Mr. John Penn, for Lewisham; the Hon. Humphrey N. Sturt, for Dorset, East; Mr. John E. Redmond, for Waterford; Mr. E. T. Holden, for Walsall; Mr. R. C. Jebb, for Cambridge University; Mr. Martin Flavin, for Cork; Mr. P. Macdermott, for Kilkenny, N.; the Hon. W. F. D. Smith, for Strand, Westminster; Mr. Dunbar P. Barton, for Armagh, Mid.; Mr. G. Lambert, for Devon, S. Molton Division; Mr. J. H. Maden, for Lancaster, Rossendale Division.

#### MINISTERIAL NOTICES OF MOTION.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I beg to give notice that on Thursday I shall ask leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to Local Government in Ireland and for other purposes connected therewith; and also to bring in a Bill to amend the procedure with respect to Private Bills in Ireland and Scotland.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. H. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to give notice that on Thursday I shall ask leave to bring in a Bill to facilitate the acquisition of small agricultural holdings.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND** (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I beg to give notice that on Thursday next I shall ask leave to bring in a Bill to improve National Education in Ireland.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: I beg to give notice that on Thursday I shall move that Mr. De Cobain be required to attend in his place on this day fortnight.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**MR. LABOUCHERE**: I see the First Lord of the Treasury in his place, and would ask him to be kind enough to state at what time he proposes to adjourn the debate to-morrow in order that the new Bills may be brought in.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: I think it would be particularly convenient, in accordance with the usual practice, to adjourn the debate soon after 3 o'clock to-morrow, and that will give ample time to hon. Gentlemen to bring in their Bills.

**MR. SEXTON**: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before making the Motion of which he has given notice with reference to Mr. De Cobain, he proposes to lay any Papers on the Table?

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: I shall consult with my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, who knows rather more about the case than I do; but I should think there are no Papers which it would be necessary to lay on the Table. Of course, if there are, they will be laid on the Table.

#### THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

**MR. SPEAKER** reported Her Majesty's Speech, made that day by Her CHANCELLOR, and read it to the House.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

(5.50.) **MR. HERMON HODGE** (Lancashire, N.E.) (who wore the uniform of the Oxford Volunteer Hussars) said: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a custom long established, I rise to ask this House to adopt an Address of Thanks to Her Gracious Majesty for the Speech which has just been delivered from the Chair.

It has ever been a custom for those who preceded me in this honourable and difficult duty to ask for, and to invariably receive, the kind and considerate indulgence of hon. Members of this House, and I can assure the House that never was that appeal made with less affectation or greater sincerity than I make it to the House to-night. I think it will be felt that my task is an exceptionally difficult and even painful one on this occasion, for my first duty is to refer to the distressing announcement which stands in the forefront of Her Majesty's Speech with reference to the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale. It is very difficult and hard for me, just at a time when the nation is beginning to recover somewhat, we hope, at all events, from the shock which it sustained by that painful event—it is difficult and hard for me *infandum renovare dolorem*. The feeling of intense grief which fills the heart of every Member of this House upon this subject must find an utterance here, and I will venture to make myself the humble means of offering to our beloved Queen our deep sympathy in her great sorrow, for as she is the highest in the land, so is she ever the foremost to offer to the humblest of her subjects her kindly sympathy whenever trouble or afflictions overtake them. Upon the grief of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales I will not venture to intrude, and I know not how to find words in which to give utterance to the feeling which must arise in the hearts of all of us with regard to the young Princess, who yesterday was about to wed with one she loved so well, and whose approaching nuptials made the heart of England so glad that you could almost hear her marriage bells. I must now, Sir, leave this painful subject with a reflection suggested by the Speech itself: that in all this gloom there is this bright thing, in all this bitterness there is this sweet, in all this sorrow there is this comfort, and it is the wonderful demonstration of love and loyalty which has reached Her Gracious Majesty from every portion of her vast dominions. This is the golden light shining behind

the cloud. An Empire such as ours is bound together by many a tie, but no bond is of more importance in the maintenance of that Empire than the sentiment of loyalty. Patriotism may turn the thoughts of the subjects of the Queen to their homes in any part of her vast dependencies; but loyalty turns the thoughts, the eyes, the hearts of every citizen of this Empire to England and to England's Queen, and fosters the wish that the Queen may be long preserved in her station as Ruler of this Empire. We are met to-day under a new leader for the first time, and I am sure that the thoughts of hon. Members still revert with kindness to the amiable gentleman who so lately occupied that high position. When Mr. Smith was taken from us the people of England lost a good friend, and the Queen a faithful servant. Of the qualities and abilities of the right hon. Gentleman who has succeeded him good taste forbids me to speak. They are well known to this House, and they deserve, and I am sure they will command, the support and confidence and respect of the House of Commons. The most important communication, perhaps, contained in the Royal Speech is that peace still prevails, and it becomes almost a wonder passing our understanding that it has been maintained at all. Great, indeed, is the debt which this country owes to Lord Salisbury, and it has been gratefully and graciously expressed by many of his strongest and most distinguished political opponents. Great is the debt this nation owes to Lord Salisbury, who has for so long a time, and with such success, borne upon his shoulders the immense responsibility of the management of our foreign affairs. If that policy, friendly but firm, be continued, if it be supported, as it is now, and as it ought to be, by an adequate development of our system of national defence, including the Reserve forces—such as that force of Volunteer Cavalry whose uniform I have the honour to wear—supported by an Army increasing and improving as our Army is in equipment, efficiency and organisation, and above all by a Navy adequate to protect our coasts, our commerce, and the food supply of our people; then, indeed, we may look for-

ward with confidence to a long continuance of our present peace, and of the prosperity which follows in its train. These subjects are mentioned for our special attention. The country learned with the deepest regret the intelligence of the death of the Viceroy of Egypt, in whom Her Majesty has lost a loyal ally, and the people of Egypt a true friend. Our co-operation with, our support of, the Government of the late Viceroy, has been creditable to this country, most creditable to those who have represented this country in Egypt, and most advantageous to the people of Egypt themselves. Its results are the improvement in the administration of justice, lessened taxation, increased trade, greater liberty to the people themselves, and a financial position which surprises even those who have most at heart the interest of that country. It has not escaped popular attention in this country that the young Prince Abbas, the Khedive who has succeeded in his father's place (having been named by a Firman of his Imperial Majesty the Sultan), on his accession received every demonstration of loyalty and satisfaction on the part of both pashas and people. This is a case in which, if there had been dissatisfaction or discontent, it would have been impossible to imagine that it would not have made itself apparent. Surely it would be unwise of us, unworthy of us, most unfair to the new Khedive, to withdraw that support which we gave to his predecessor, were we to leave Egypt until the work we have begun is placed on a solid and enduring basis. Then, and not till then, can we leave Egypt with the goodwill of every friend of Egypt, from His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, to the humblest tiller of the soil. The question of seal fishing in Behring Sea is in a fair way to be settled by arbitration. Any development of the principle of settlement of disputes by arbitration, whether it be the humblest trade dispute in this country, or a dispute endangering the friendly relations between two great nations like Canada and the United States, would be most welcome to this House. Zanzibar, by arrangement with the Sultan, has been declared a free port. This will be welcome news, indeed, both to the merchants and manufacturers of this

country, and especially welcome to those whom I have the honour to represent in this House, the working people of Lancashire. New markets are hard to find. The Trade Returns to hand, I believe, for Zanzibar, show the marvellous rapidity with which our manufacturers avail themselves of any opportunity of that sort. It is not expecting too much when I say I have little doubt that the dominions of the Sultan will be largely benefitted by the action he has thought well to take in this matter. I do not know if I should be going too far outside of the special business before us if I were to make an appeal to the House for the most favourable consideration to those pioneers of ours in Africa who are now raising our flag there. I do not make the appeal for generous consideration for them simply because they are enterprising and energetic, but because of the working classes, who will in the future benefit by the action they are now taking. I should like to allude very briefly to two of the legislative proposals mentioned in the Speech. The chief place amongst them has, of course, been given to the proposal for applying to Ireland the general principles affecting local government, which have been already applied to Great Britain. And why not? Great success has attended the establishment of it in England and Scotland; the marvellously improved condition of Ireland, the prosperity of that country, is admitted on all hands. The very fact that it has not been necessary for Her Majesty to make any allusion in Her Speech to the condition of that country makes it evident that those who are responsible to her feel no anxiety on the subject. It is incontestible, and under these circumstances it seems to me that the Government are not only justified, but are bound to submit to this House, and to pass through the House, a Bill having for its object the placing of the Irish people on a footing, speaking broadly and generally, of equality with Englishmen and Scotchmen in this matter. Whether there be real grievances in Ireland against this country or not is a matter on which I hold strong opinions; but I will not express them now, as I do not want to throw down the apple of discord. But

*Mr. Hermon Hodge*

under these circumstances it would, in my opinion, establish, and justly establish, a genuine grievance in the minds of the Irish people against this country if we failed to do them this act of justice. I have confidence in the Measures, and I have confidence in the Ministers, that they will be able to give to the House a Bill which will satisfy every legitimate requirement of every reasonable Irishman for local self-government, and will absolutely safeguard the interests of every class in Ireland. I will pass to a Bill which I will call something in the nature of an interesting experiment: it is for establishing what are commonly called small holdings. I will point out, not only for the information of the House, but to remove an apprehension which exists largely outside, that it is not intended to, in any way whatever, do away with the system of large farms, but to supplement that system by the creation of smaller holdings. It is another proof of the Government's anxiety to increase the number of cultivating owners. They have already given proof of this by their Allotments Act, and their action in Ireland. The Bill, I presume, will embody the Report of the Committee which sat on this subject not long ago. It will give a popularly elected local authority power to purchase land for the purpose of re-selling it in small holdings. I hope it will not stop there, but that it will give power to the local authority to lease land for the purposes of sub-letting in still smaller portions. I attach much importance to this, because while there are many men who would hesitate to put themselves at once into the responsible position of small owners, there are large numbers who would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of becoming tenants of the local authority; and who, by that means, and by the exercise of a little thrift, might convert their occupancy eventually into ownership. I do not think there will be any necessity for compulsion in this matter. There is plenty of land to be got. Anybody who goes through an agricultural district will see on almost every barn end notices of sale, showing a sale of stock and effects has just taken place, or is about to take place. The whole question of agricultural depression is

raised by this Bill. Its causes have been long predicted, and they are the result of the free importation of large quantities of food, which has conferred great benefit, especially on places like London and Lancashire, where great masses of population are gathered together, but at a heavy cost to the home producer. The attitude of landlords and tenants throughout all this long-continued depression has been well worthy of our admiration, and the right hon. Member for Midlothian—whom I regret not to see in his place, which I hope is not due to ill-health—speaking on a Motion similar to this in 1890, used the language of compliment towards landlords and tenants, and their attitude throughout this depression. But he said, I think—"I wish them well through with it; indeed, I believe they are well through with it," or words to that effect. I thank him for the wish, but regret that his idea should not have been verified by the facts. We have no hope, we have no help, we see no likelihood of getting through. How can it be through? If you go on to the land and look into the wallets of the agricultural labourers what will you find? American bacon, American cheese, and bread made from foreign flour, or from flour made from wheat grown in this country at a loss to the producer. In such a matter as this I would not like to use the language of exaggeration, and I will not rely on any language of my own; facts and figures are more eloquent. Last year the average price of wheat was a little over 30s. Last week in Reading Market that was the average price at which it was quoted, and I believe last week at Swindon and Bristol the papers quote as low as 26s. and 24s. These are figures eloquent to anyone interested in the matter. The results of this depression are manifest and manifold, and affect the whole community. This Bill does not profess to touch the causes of agricultural depression, but to prevent one of the most remarkable results of the depression. It does hope to check, in some degree at all events, the migration of labourers from the country districts to the large towns which has lately attracted attention, and will

attract more before we have done with it. This is not a migration of agricultural labourers from purely country districts to small towns, but the migration from agricultural districts and small towns of numbers of young lads and able-bodied young men into the large industrial towns, to shoulder each other in the already overcrowded labour market. You have seen in London something of this agricultural depression. A great stream of these men came into the city and met another stream of those indigent foreigners who come to this port until the floods surged up into the streets of London under the name of the "Unemployed"—you see it, and know how grave the question is, and I apologise for detaining the House so long on this matter; but I am sure it will join in giving a welcome to this measure, which is destined to check somewhat this migration, not by placing artificial barriers in the way of those who want to go to our towns, but by offering greater inducements to them to stay on the land, where, by their knowledge and education, they can use their abilities with the best advantage to themselves and to their country. I believe the House would welcome any experiment, if it were only to raise the fringe of the pall which is lying over industry in far too many parts of our country. I can only thank the House for the kind and considerate manner in which it has listened to me. There is a lengthy list of measures to come before the House, and if I do not deal with them it will be out of consideration for the time of the House, and out of consideration for my hon. and learned Friend who will follow me, to whose legal mind it will be seen at once many of the subjects especially lend themselves. I may only hope that there are those to follow whose rising in this House is anticipated with eagerness, and whose words are listened to with the respect they deserve. I hope I have avoided referring to anything which may raise unnecessary controversy, and also that nothing I have said will tend, in the slightest degree, to prevent the House passing, at an early moment, the Address which I now have the honour of moving.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
 "That an humble Address be presented  
 to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

We take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the afflicting dispensation of Providence with which Your Majesty and this Nation have been visited, in the death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale:

We assure Your Majesty of our heartfelt participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Your Majesty's family under this grievous affliction, and in the deep sense entertained by all classes of Your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which the country has sustained by the loss of a Prince who had won for himself the general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."

\*(6.23.) MR. MILVAIN (Durham), who wore Court dress: I cordially endorse the eloquent terms in which my hon. and gallant Friend has spoken in reference to the painful announcement of the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale. We, indeed, deeply participate in the terrible sorrow which Her Majesty the Queen and her family have sustained in the loss of the young Prince, whose life at a moment so singularly unfortunate has been taken away. That a Prince, the future heir to the Throne of this country, full of life, hope, and vigour, conscious of, and anxious to perform the responsible duties which would fall upon him, on the eve of the consummation of what he regarded as his earthly happiness, should be snatched away by the hand of death is a tragedy more painful and more cruel than has ever been recorded in the pages of fiction. It is not only in that respect we would as loyal and faithful subjects extend our sympathy to Her Majesty and to her family, but as those possessing human instincts sorrowing with loving and devoted parents who, after patient and anxious watching,

mourn over the death of their firstborn. The hand of death, Mr. Speaker, has played much havoc in the rank and file of public men in this country during the last few months; and I cannot pass away from this mournful subject without some reference to the loss this House and the country has sustained by the death of our late leader, Mr. Smith. His kind and courteous manner, his ever faithful obedience to the calls of his country, will make his place a difficult one to fill. But when we turn away from those whose deaths the country deplores — has not the country reason to congratulate itself that there are men of courage and ability capable of taking their places, whether it be as Royal Prince to perform the duties of the future heir to the Throne of England, or statesman to undertake those still more arduous and responsible ones of leading one of the great Parties of the State. May I now pass to other subjects mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. That the relations of this country continue to be friendly with other Powers is always a satisfactory announcement to Her Majesty's subjects, and particularly to the trading population of this Empire. That the dispute between Canada and the United States of America in reference to the seal fishing in Behring Sea is to be referred, I believe, to the arbitration of five lawyers of neutral Powers, is information which cannot fail to be acceptable to the country. It is a policy, Sir, which ought always to be followed by Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, connected as they are by the ties of relationship, to settle such disputes as are calculated to create friction, in a manner at once impartial and friendly. The country is to be congratulated on the acquisition of a free port at Zanzibar. Before quitting this part of Her Majesty's Speech, may I express my satisfaction at the policy which has enabled Her Majesty to give such assurances, so acceptable to her subjects, for, in my opinion, it is one of the functions of Government, if not the chief, to maintain an honourable peace; to seek for and provide additional free markets for our industry, and to

encourage her subjects to embark in commercial enterprise under the assurance that the flag under which they trade shall be honoured, and that they may enjoy in security the fruit of their labours. As is usual, the Estimates for the Public Services are to be prepared on sound and economical financial lines, so far, I should hope, as is consistent with efficiency. But Her Majesty's faithful Commons are not generally economisers of the public time in their laudable ambition to be defenders of the public purse. I turn to that part of the Speech which deals with the legislative proposals for the Session; and I am pleased to see it is the intention of the Government to apply to Ireland the principle of local government on the same lines as have been followed in England and Scotland, where they have operated so satisfactorily. Many of us, and I among them, have advocated on the platform and elsewhere the equality of the treatment of Ireland whenever she may be prepared to receive it, and I am glad, Sir, that it is apparent from Her Majesty's Speech that that time has now arrived; and I feel sure that the details of this measure will be awaited with the greatest interest, not only by those whose avowed policy it is to capture every representative institution as a stepping stone to ulterior political objects, but by those also who for these reasons think there ought to be certain safeguards against extravagance, maladministration and oppression. We are asked to consider a Bill in reference to Irish education. If my memory serves me aright, some £200,000 was voted last year, and allocated to this purpose. Here, again, is another instance of that equality of treatment to which I have referred. Largely assisted education has been extended to Scotland and England, and has worked exceptionally well. I know it will be a satisfaction to those who feared for the existence of the voluntary system of education to know that the system is in no danger, but can be shown to stand on a firmer foundation than ever it did before. Compulsory education, I think, at the present time, does not extend to Ireland; but for the same reason, equality of treatment with England

and Scotland, I hope there may be some modified system of compulsory education introduced into Ireland, to apply to those districts which are ready for it. To Scotland and to Ireland it is proposed to introduce a modification of the existing system of procedure on Private Bills. A Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament was appointed some years ago, and reported in favour of a devolution of the duties of Committees of both Houses to a local Commission. Scotchmen and Irishmen complain of the expense and delay of bringing the parties up to Westminster, and they complain of the waste of time on the part of their public and business men from the same cause, and they maintain that a Commission on the spot would be better informed regarding the desirability of proposed public works. The grievance is a genuine one, and I hope it may prove an additional reason for facilitating this legislation, in that thereby Members of this House will be relieved from some of the burdens that fall upon them as servants of the public. To India it is proposed to extend some of the principles of representative institutions, which may be productive of freer discussion and expression of opinion, and thus bring their Councils into closer touch with the Home Government. Proposals are to be made for improving the discipline of the clergy of the Church of England. It being the especial duty of the clergy to look after the moral and religious welfare of their people, a measure calculated to promptly remove a clergyman found guilty of an offence against the criminal law of the State or against public morality while discharging his sacred functions must undoubtedly commend itself not only to members of the Church of England, but also to all persons professing Christianity, and to those who profess to interest themselves in improving the moral tone of the people. I hope that circumstances may permit us to amend the law relating to evidence by enabling accused persons to be examined on their trial. To my mind such an amendment of the law is imperative. Recent circumstances have impressed this strongly on my mind. A man was



recently tried for one of those offences on which it is admissible for the accused to give evidence. He gave that evidence, and the jury acquitted him of the charge brought against him. But immediately afterwards he was charged with perjury committed in giving that evidence. He was tried for perjury, and upon that trial it was not admissible for him to give his own statement on oath in relation to the charge. It is imperative, I say, that the law as to evidence should be made general, otherwise the law which is meant to protect the freedom of the individual may be, as it was in this instance, made an instrument of persecution. I hope, too, that time may permit us to put the law relating to the liability of employers for personal injuries suffered by the employed on a permanent and more satisfactory basis. To extend the liberties of our people both at home and abroad, to remedy legitimate grievances, to increase the material well-being of our people, and to raise their moral and religious tone, is a programme of legislation on the principles of which we ought to be, and I believe we are, all agreed. Will it be too much to hope then that, for the time being, Party acrimony may be laid aside in this—possibly the last—Session of the present Parliament, and that we may unite in passing into law measures so well calculated to benefit the whole of the community. I have great pleasure in seconding the Address in reply to the Gracious Speech which has been moved by my hon. and gallant Friend.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
“That,” &c. [See page 51.]

(6.40.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): The first duty that devolves upon me to-night, in the regretted absence of my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian (Mr. Gladstone), is to express the deep sympathy of gentlemen sitting on this side of the House in the mournful subject which occupies the first portion of the Speech from the Throne, as I am sure it occupies the first place in the heart of the nation. That painful subject has been referred to with much eloquence and propriety by the Mover and Seconder of the Address, and I am sure I am

speaking the sentiments of gentlemen who sit on both sides of the House when I say that the duty delegated to them has never been performed with more grace and greater propriety than on the present occasion. Of the Mover of the Address I will say that the ability and eloquence he has displayed makes us regret that we have not more often heard him in our debates before. The hon. Gentleman who seconded will allow me to congratulate him upon the ability which he has exhibited in his speech to-night, an ability with which we are more acquainted. As regards the first paragraph in the Speech, I cannot but feel that in its wording we hear something more than the ordinary and formal expression of grief. I think we seem to recognise in it the personal accents of the sorrow of the Queen. Her Majesty may be assured that in the language of the Speech the House of Commons deeply participates in her distress. It would ill represent the nation of which it claims to be the principal representative if the House of Commons did not express to-night to the Sovereign the deep sympathy of her people. The people have not forgotten, they constantly and gratefully remember, how under the burden of many years and many sorrows Her Majesty has faithfully discharged her duty to the nation over which she rules. Few people are aware of the wearisome daily toil, the various and constant anxiety which occupies the life of the head of such an Empire as this, and few but those who have to endure it can know how great a weight is added to these labours by the pressure of domestic grief. In all the changes and chances which have befallen this great realm during Her Majesty's long reign, the Queen has ever been the first to sympathise in the perils and sorrows of her subjects. Ever since that great calamity which descended on her 30 years ago, a sorrow which, while it made her a widow, still left her Queen, she has had to discharge those great duties alone. The strong arm and wise counsel upon which she rested so fondly have been long withdrawn. She has had to bear alone the great burden of Empire; and how faithfully, how unselfishly, how

*Mr. Milvain*

devotedly she has constantly discharged those duties is in the mind of this House, and dwells in the hearts of the people. In a touching and melancholy message she lately addressed to her people, the Queen has spoken pathetically of other sorrows that have befallen her family. She has told us there is none equal to this. The hand of death has fallen on the direct line of her succession, under circumstances most sudden and most heartrending, in the midst of bright hopes now quenched, amid happy expectations for the future, happy anticipations, now buried in the grave. The Duke of Clarence had but a short time in which to make himself known to the people at large, but of him it may be truly said that those who knew him best loved him most. There was a gentle straightforward simplicity in his character, and a sympathetic kindness of disposition which made him the friend and favourite of all his companions, and which one day would have endeared him to the nation over which he was destined to rule. Of the sorrow of his parents, the Prince and Princess of Wales, it is difficult to speak; it is far easier to feel than to utter the sentiments which belong to that bitter anguish of those who have lost their first-born—probably the greatest sorrow that can enter the palace or the hut. In this, at least, we may truly say that the nation grieves with their grief. The Prince and Princess of Wales have made themselves beloved by the English people, the one by his dignified courtesy and kindness to all, the other by her tender heart and her matchless grace, and they deeply enlist the sympathy of the people with a sentiment of almost personal attachment. There is one other figure which the Mover of this Address referred to in very appropriate terms: I mean the young Princess who was a mourner before she became a bride, whose affections and hopes were welcomed and shared by the sympathy of the nation, which read in them bright auguries of future happiness and love. All these have been blighted in the bud, and to her out of the warmth of its sympathy and commiseration I am sure this House will send a message of condolence. All I have more to say is that in every part of the House I am sure the paragraph of condolence to

the Queen will receive hearty and cordial acquiescence. There is one other topic of sad reflection which I cannot pass over in silence. We miss from the front bench opposite the late Leader of the House, whom we remember with personal regard and with high esteem, and whom we have lost with great regret. His invariable courtesy, his native good humour, his singular tact, and his habitual good sense made him loved and followed by his friends, liked, and respected by his political opponents. There have been, no doubt, men of greater oratorical powers and higher intellectual gifts in that position; there have been none, I think, who more faithfully and honourably discharged the duties of that high and difficult position he was called upon to fill, and which he well fulfilled. I may, perhaps, be allowed to say in one sentence that we recognize the claims of his successor to the place which he holds. The Leadership of the House of Commons is, in my opinion, the highest position which a subject can hold, and is one which requires high qualifications. No doubt in the course of our debates in the honourable contest of Parliamentary warfare we shall often cross swords with the right hon. Gentleman; but we shall always be ready to render to him, as we shall expect from him, every assistance in maintaining the dignity and privileges of this House, and in conducting the affairs of the House of Commons to its own honour and to the advantage of the country. Now, turning to other parts of the Speech, I do not think that upon foreign affairs it is necessary that I should make any special remark. We look upon it as highly satisfactory that the complexion of peace should preside over the report from the Sovereign of our relations with foreign countries. I shall not be tempted, even by some remarks which fell from the Mover of the Address, to enter upon the disputed question of Egypt to-night; but before I go to what may be considered probably the principal topics suggested in the Speech let me refer to one topic upon which, carefully as the hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion went through the list, neither he or the hon. Gentleman the Mover said a single word.

This topic lies apparently in a dark corner at the end of the Speech, but it is a matter of enormous consequence, if it mean anything at all. That neither the Mover or Seconder had anything to say upon the Bill for revising the existing arrangements between the Government and the Bank of England is certainly most remarkable. Revising the existing arrangements between the Government and the Bank of England! Why, this means—if it mean anything at all—the repeal of the Bank Charter of Sir Robert Peel of 1844, and the substitution of a new system of currency for this country. Now, that may be a good or a bad thing to do, but it is no small thing to be put into an obscure corner of a Speech from the Throne, no notice being taken of it. I have heard members of the Government to-night give notice of the Bills they propose to introduce; but I did not hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer express any intention of bringing forward this question of currency. The remarkable point is that this is the one novelty in the Speech. The other subjects make but a catalogue of remanets. They are old familiar friends, who have appeared on the scene from time to time, they are ancient promises which have never been fulfilled, and are perhaps predestined for the fate which has in previous years overtaken them. I do not know what the Government regard as the principal measures of the Session. I hope we shall hear what are the Bills it is intended first to proceed with, how the right hon. Gentleman means to proceed with them, and in what way their progress is intended to be conducted. I observe a remarkable contrast between the view of the Government this Session and that which was put forward last year. When there were two important Bills laid before us—the Land Bill and the Tithes Bill—we were told it was necessary to read these a second time before Christmas; we should now like to know what are the more important among the Bills indicated which we shall be asked to read a second time before Easter. But going back again to this agreement with the Bank of England I have this to say, that I think it is no light matter to be hung

up, to be dangled in the air. These projects for revolutionising the currency of the country deeply affect all commercial undertakings, and they keep the monied classes in a state of feverish anxiety. What I am disposed to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer is whether he means business or not? Now, the position in which he has placed himself is a singular and I think an unfortunate one. For three years—I think I am right—in succession, bearing in mind the restoration of the gold coinage to a proper condition, he has postponed that measure, because it was necessary to connect it with a reform of the system of currency in this country. On that ground it has year after year been postponed. Last year I reluctantly consented to a temporary measure of reform of the gold coinage, which has not, I believe, up to this time been carried out. Then came the great Baring panic and scare, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not go to the House of Commons, but makes an after-dinner speech at Leeds, in which he propounds a scheme for the reform of the currency of the country. Well, that infant had but a short unhealthy life. It never came before the House of Commons after being exhibited to the merchants in Leeds; it was made away with by its own parent. Then the right hon. Gentleman has come forward with another scheme, which again, I hope, he is going to tell us will be brought before the House of Commons. It has, at all events, been produced as an essay before some commercial circles in the City of London; but I am not sure that it was well understood or warmly accepted. Now, what is the foundation of all these dealings, or, rather, nibblings, at the currency of the country? The right hon. Gentleman stated—and a graver statement by a Finance Minister of this country could not be made—that he considered the banking system of this country unsatisfactory and unsafe. He said the bank reserves were insufficient, and that great peril might naturally result from this condition of things. Well, if that be so, then the Finance Minister of this country is bound to take the earliest opportunity to bring forward a measure

*Sir William Harcourt*

to deal with this danger. That is a proposition not to be disputed. No such measure has been laid before the House. It is true he has said in his speeches that he has induced the bankers to keep larger reserves; he has said that the reserves are insufficient. I should like to know when he is prepared to say that he would consider the reserves of the banks to be sufficient? I must take this opportunity of protesting against the Chancellor of the Exchequer throwing out a succession of speculative schemes for dealing with what he calls "the great financial dangers of this country"—schemes which are calculated to disturb the mind of everybody; and the remarkable part of the matter is, that in not one of them does he propose to deal with the danger. He has admitted that the powers must be of a very interdictory character; and they go only to increasing the gold in the Issue Department of the Bank of England. The Leeds scheme has gone; the scheme of the Second Reserve is admitted to be imperfect; what has become of the last scheme? The last scheme was propounded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the City; there was a formal meeting there of merchants and bankers, and I should say that to take the opinion of merchants and bankers upon a matter in which they have different interests to those of the community is not the manner in which a question of this kind should be dealt with. But what happened when this discussion took place? An hon. Member opposite could tell the House something about it; but the upshot of it was, that when this measure was mentioned a gentleman, as far as I can understand, moved the Previous Question upon the scheme of the Exchequer, and it was ordered to be read a second time that day six months. My object in making these observations is to induce the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell the House of Commons and the country what he is going to do about the currency of England. If he will allow me to say so without offence, he has gone on fumbling with the currency question. That is not the way in which the great questions of the finance of this country

have been dealt with by financiers of former times. When the great measure for regulating the specie bullion of this country took place there was a Bullion Committee appointed, and the Bullion Committee and the Government acted upon their own responsibility in 1826, when the one-pound notes were abolished. That was upon the responsibility of the Government of the day. When the Bank Charter came, which has preserved the commercial system of this country for half a century, Sir Robert Peel took upon himself the responsibility of the measure; he did not go hawking this measure about at City meetings or in after-dinner speeches, seeking if he could get anybody to take it; there was a Motion made, and he gave to the House of Commons a measure which, on the responsibility of the Government, they were ready to present for the acceptance of Parliament and of the nation. And I do think that we should have done with this tentative system of dealing with this question, and that the right hon. Gentleman should tell us, as Financial Ministers have told us in former days, what he is going to do? The present system is intolerable. Here is the Chancellor of the Exchequer telling the country that their financial system is unsound; that their banking system is insufficient; and yet we have no responsible measure brought forward by the Government for dealing with a matter which is of the most serious kind. Therefore, especially because nothing has been said by the Mover and Seconder upon this question, I venture to say that we should be told by the Government what they are really going to do in the matter. There is another very important matter dealt with in this Speech, and that is English Local Government. I have seen a good many Queen's Speeches in my time, I am sorry to say; but I do not think I ever saw a subject introduced in a less encouraging manner than this has been on the present occasion, showing that the Government had no real intentions of giving effect to it, or indeed any desire that it should pass into law; because the Speech says that "it may be possible to consider the provisions of an English Local Government Bill." If this is all the Govern-

ment can say on the first night of the Session I think the augury is unfavourable. I am not very much surprised at that. The Mover spoke with much warmth and enthusiasm in favour of some measure of that kind. He has the advantage of being younger than the First Minister of the Crown; but I cannot say that the language employed by the Prime Minister the other day at Exeter showed any great desire for the promotion of such a measure. He spoke in a manner which may be described as modest. He holds himself responsible for qualified assistance in the creation of County Councils, and probably if he had the opportunity he would be responsible for creating District Councils; but he is quite sure in both cases he would be responsible for considerable addition to the rates. When language of this kind is used, I should be greatly disappointed if the measure were passed into law. He says District Councils will add to the rates, without any more effective remedy than that which for centuries has worked perfectly well, so that the Local Government is to be an expensive substitute for what has for centuries worked fairly well. Further, he says, "I do not see that independent Councils will do any particular harm beyond raising the rates." so that I cannot see how he could have more effectually thrown cold water upon the measure than he has done by this language. I do not know whether he regards those District Councils as places of amusement; but I have always regarded them, and I have always heard them spoken of, as a means of safeguarding and fostering in the rural districts an interest in the management of local affairs among a class that have little to vary the monotony of their daily toil; we hoped that Councils of that description would be a source of independence and self-reliance; that they would acquire a habit of dealing with matters concerning their own interests; and I confess I think it a little unfortunate that these things should be sneered at in this lordly way. I will remind the Prime Minister of the lines of a poem with which we are all acquainted.

"Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile  
The short and simple annals of the poor."

*Sir William Harcourt*

And I think if he had recollected those lines he would have abstained from indulging in the sneer with which he has referred to this question. I am delighted to see on the opposite bench an eminent comrade of my right hon. Friend, the Minister of Agriculture. We all remember the eloquent and able part he took in the memorable debate on the Address in 1886. Well, I hope that this Bill is conceived, and I feel sure it is conceived, in a very different spirit from that in which the Prime Minister treated it; because he said of these small holdings, "They will not operate to any great degree in relieving the particular sufferings of the poorer classes." That is just what we wish they should do; but Lord Salisbury apparently has other objects; he thinks if he could only get a sufficient number of small holdings they might combine together and put permanent rates upon taxpayers of this country, rates which have always been charged upon the land, like the tithe, subject to which it has been bought and sold for centuries. They propose to put it upon the taxpayers, and then there is talk by these gentlemen of "spoliation of the rights of property." I hope when the right hon. Gentleman opposite comes to introduce his Bill we shall find that this Bill has been conceived in a very different spirit from that. Lastly, I wish to touch upon the subject of Irish Local Government. We should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman the course he intends to take in regard to that Bill. Does he mean to read it a second time before Easter, or does he not? What is to be the conduct of business in respect to this matter? It is hardly necessary to say in regard to the general policy of Local Government for Ireland that it is one which we favour and have always wished to see carried out; and if a genuine and honest measure for extending Local Government to Ireland is brought forward, certainly we shall have no indisposition to give our support to this measure. But, at the same time, we should desire to say that we, of course, upon this side do not regard the question of Local Government as settling the question of self-government for Ireland. We have always regarded

this as a separate thing; both necessary, and not as one excluding the other. In fact, ever since the question of Home Rule has been raised it has been perfectly well recognised, and Local Government will not meet the demands, at all events of those who advocate the principles of Home Rule. I can quote no higher authority upon that subject than my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain). On the 14th March, 1887, speaking at Birmingham, he said—and he was speaking in condemnation of Home Rule—"We believe"—and I would ask the attention of the House to these words—

"We believe, and no one stated it more clearly than Lord Hartington, that the situation depends upon the actions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and that in the future it would be useless to talk of measures which would have been sufficient before, and that we are bound to consider now from a higher and wider standpoint the requirements for making more extensive concessions, and accordingly our position was that while we were willing to agree in the future to the creation of some legislative authority in Dublin, in accordance with Mr. Gladstone's proposals, we would not consent to a scheme so long as the safeguards provided by Mr. Gladstone were in our opinion totally illusory."

That was what the right hon. Gentleman said. Since the introduction of the Home Rule Bill in 1886 there was no use of talking of limited measures. My right hon. Friend is now in a position to aid largely in the elucidation of this question, and I should like to see his Bill for a legislative authority in Dublin upon Mr. Gladstone's principle, with the safeguards which he would think it necessary to introduce in it. But whether it is a question of Local Government or of Home Rule, what I think we have to consider is the spirit in which this House and the Government are about to approach the question of dealing with the people of Ireland. After all, that is quite as important as any detail, or as any clause of the Bill; and as upon the Address, not only the measures indicated in the Speech but also the conduct of the Executive Government is subject for criticism and comment, I cannot conclude what I have to say without asking the attention of the House and the country to

the spirit and the language in which the Prime Minister recently referred to this question. It was in a speech made a few days ago, in which the principal question treated of was the equal treatment of England and Ireland in the matter of Local Government. Now, the Mover of the Address in his language left nothing to be desired; but what a contrast is there to the spirit and tone in which the Prime Minister of this country went so far as to heap insult upon the majority of the people of Ireland. In dealing with the question of how the people of Ireland are to be treated, Lord Salisbury said of the majority of the people of Ireland that they contain "all that is backward and all that is retrogressive; all that is contrary to civilisation and enlightenment." [*Cheers.*] I hear the cheers of Members for Ulster upon that speech; and I hear the Solicitor General cheer. The Solicitor General will have to retract that cheer, as he has had to retract many things both of law and fact. [*Laughter and counter cheers.*] I am glad, at least, that the Prime Minister has one faithful supporter and cheerer in his Solicitor General. Having thus degraded the majority of the people of Ireland—the people to whom we are going to give Local Government and equal rights to the people of England—I should like to see the Prime Minister address the same language to the English people. Then he proceeds with a violent invective against the Catholics and their Bishops; the Archbishops he stigmatises by name—somewhat unusual language, I believe, to be used by a person in the position of the Prime Minister. The Catholic people of Ireland he says have fought against us when we quarrelled with Spain, when we quarrelled with France, and when we quarrelled with America. Will the Solicitor General consider that language displays political wisdom on the part of a statesman? I will say something of that presently; but this I will say now, that those statements are absolutely unfounded in history, as they are unstatesmanlike in character. I have here somewhere a passage in which I could convince the House absolutely of that. You have only to go to a writer whom we all respect—

Mr. Lecky—and you will find that he states that in the troubles of 1715, the troubles of 1745, and in the great war against France, which ended in the peace of 1763, the Catholics of Ireland took no part against England. You will find it stated by Mr. Lecky that throughout the whole of the eighteenth century, far from its being true that the Catholics of Ireland were the cause of the disturbance, that it was the Presbyterians and Protestants who were at the bottom of the revolution. If you mention the names of the great revolutionists of Ireland—such as Wolfe Tone, and others—you will find they are not the names of Catholics, but of Protestants. In the great struggle of the American War everybody knows it was the Presbyterians, who largely colonised America, that got sympathy for America in Ireland, and that with the Protestants of the North and not with the Catholics of the South; while we all know what took place between Mr. Pitt and the Catholic Bishops of Ireland. Therefore this statement, that the Catholics as distinguished from the Protestants of Ireland were the enemies of this country is historically false, is one which ought never to have been advanced; and, in my opinion, a more unjustifiable, or a more detestable attempt for Party purposes to create ill-feeling and rancour between different parts and portions of people of the United Kingdom has never been recorded. I should like to ask the House what it should have thought if the Governor General of Canada had made such a speech reflecting upon the Canadian people? There you have two races and two religions; you have them enjoying that Home Rule for which Ireland is declared to be unfitted. If the Governor General of Canada had made a speech in which he said the Catholic population contained all that was backward, and all that was contrary to civilisation and enlightenment—supposing he had tried to revive memories of the Canadian rebellion; and supposing he had denounced the Canadian people, their religion and their priesthood, what would have been done? You would not only have been asked to dismiss him. He would have been packed off, and you would not have

*Sir William Harcourt*

been asked to send another in his place. If this had been an Indian question would the Viceroy have held this language? And for what purpose is this language employed? It is to show that though the majority may rule, and does rule, in England, though the majority does rule in Canada and in Australia, it should not rule in Ireland—first, on account of the inferiority of the race; and, secondly, because of the influence and character of the priests. Therefore, it is not the majority that is to rule in Ireland, but the minority. The minority is to rule in virtue of the superiority of their race and the preferable character of their religion; and the influence of the Catholic priesthood is to be destroyed by a Protestant nation and by a Government which sent the Duke of Norfolk on a Mission to the Vatican. It is the pure unmitigated doctrine of a race domination and a Protestant ascendancy. The language of Lord Salisbury shows that the Government of this country is the Government of an Orange Lodge. The oath of supremacy and allegiance that ought to be tendered at this Table is the “glorious, pious and immortal memory,” and the Chief Secretary ought to appear in this House sitting astride the great gun of Athlone. That is really the natural consequence of such language. It is because the Union is regarded by the Unionists from this point of view that it is detested, and justly detested, by the people of Ireland. There is no country and no people in this world that would not resent and resist to the utmost of their power treatment such as is represented by this language. If the Irish people are not your enemies it is certainly not because men like Lord Salisbury have not done their best to make them so. There is another view of this question. What do you suppose is likely to be the effect of this brutal and tyrannical language on the population of our Empire abroad? I have pointed out what would be the effect if language of this kind were applied to Hindostan. Why, even the Hottentots of the Cape receive more considerate treatment than the Hottentots of Ireland. But what will the Irish people and the Irish Catholics in Canada think of this lan-

guage? What will the Irish Catholics in Australia think of it? And, to my mind, there is a matter more important than all. There is a country whose friendship and goodwill are of more momentous importance to this country than all the European alliances—the friendship and goodwill of the United States of America. It is of the highest importance to us that we should cultivate the friendly feeling and goodwill of every part of the population of that great nation. The Irish Catholics are a very important element in the feeling and power of the United States of America. The sentiments expressed by the Chief of the Government of England and Ireland for the present moment will very sensibly tend to affect those populations. What do you suppose is likely to be the effect on American sentiment and feeling of language such as this? If you desired deliberately to breed ill will in America towards Great Britain you could not take a measure that could be more effectual for that purpose. Suppose the Ruler of Germany were to address any of his populations in this fashion; suppose he said to the Catholic people of Bavaria—which enjoys Home Rule to a far larger extent than will even be demanded for Ireland—suppose he were to tell them that they were very inferior to the Protestants of North Germany, and were not entitled to be treated on the same footing as other parts of the population. For us, at least, one duty is plain. The Party which sits on this side of the House is the Party that for generation after generation, and at the cost of political power for year after year, has maintained the doctrine not only of civil freedom, but of religious equality. We denounce the spirit by which language of this sort is dictated. The Liberal Party first demanded and obtained religious equality for the Non-conformists, afterwards for the Catholics, then for the Jews, and lastly in the struggle in which you engaged against the late Mr. Bradlaugh, when you had to efface your own vote from your Journals. I speak of the principles to which we have always adhered, and which we have perpetually maintained. I should like to ask, where are the Whigs on this subject? If there ever was a subject to which

the Whigs by tradition and principle were bound, it is this question of religious equality. Where are the men who profess—shall I say who pretend—to be the representatives of the principles of Burke? What was it that Burke taught with reference to the Catholics of Ireland? The principles of Fox, Grey, Grenville, and Russell. Where are the Fitzwilliams, the Carlisles, and the Cavendishes? Are the Whigs prepared to sacrifice these principles, as they have thrown overboard all the rest? I hope not. But if they are, we need not wonder why they are perishing out of the land, why they have ceased to influence the people amongst whom they were once a power, and why, like the Greeks of the Lower Empire, they will carry a memorable name to an unhonoured grave. Before I sit down I should like to read one passage. It is not from a Whig authority, but you will respect it none the less. It has been often quoted, but I will quote it once more. It gives a different view and a different reading of the causes of the evils of Ireland. It does not trace those evils to inferiority of race, or to the evils of its religious belief. These are the words—

“What is the reason that a people with so bounteous a soil, and such enormous resources as the Irish, lag so far behind the English race? Some say it is to be found in the character of the Celtic race. But I look to France, and I see a Celtic race going forward there with the most rapid strides. Some people say it is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion. But I look to Belgium, and there I see a people second to none in Europe, except English, for industry, singularly prosperous, considering the small piece of country they occupy, having improved to the utmost the natural resources of the country, and distinguished among all the people of Europe for the earnestness and intensity of their Roman Catholic belief. Therefore, I cannot say that the cause of Irish distress is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion. An hon. Friend near me says it arises from listening to demagogues. I have as much dislike to demagogues as he has; but when I look to the Northern States of America I see there a people who listen to demagogues, and who show no want of material prosperity. Therefore we cannot attribute it to demagogues, to Romanism, or to the Celtic race. What, then, is it? I am afraid the one thing that has been peculiar to Ireland has been the Government of England.”

These are the words of Lord Robert Cecil, and I commend them to the con-



science of Lord Salisbury. Unless the proposed legislation which you tell us you are going to bring forward in the interests of Ireland—this Local Government for Ireland—this treatment of Ireland on an equal footing with England—unless your legislation is to be conceived in a spirit and with objects exactly opposite and the reverse of the spirit proclaimed by the Prime Minister of England, then I venture to say your legislation, whatever it may be, will be doomed to failure and disappointment.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Mr. Speaker, whatever the House may think of the last three-quarters of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down—and on that I shall have to say a few words presently—at all events they listened, I feel certain, with perfect agreement to the eloquent passage with which he began his observations. He dwelt, as my two hon. Friends who moved and seconded the Address dwelt before him, and in language not less touching and not less eloquent than they, upon that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne in which Her Majesty speaks of the sorrow which has lately fallen upon the Royal Family. Surely, through all the many generations in which the people of this country have desired to make the joys of the ruling family their joys, and the sorrows of the ruling family their sorrows, there never has been a case in which public and official mourning has gone more nearly to the hearts and sentiments of the people of this country. To a nation who, like us, regard the Royal Family with feelings of personal loyalty and affection, and who not only do so, but regard them also as in some sort the representatives and embodiment of the great history and traditions of a free country, the death of any Prince in the direct succession to the Throne must surely be an occasion of bitter grief, and yet this has been aggravated in the present case by almost every circumstance which could add tragic significance to the event. An untimely fate has cut off the future heir to the Throne in the flower of youth, and at a time when national preparations were being

made for an event which we all looked forward to with most happy anticipations. Such circumstances must appeal to all. Some there may be to whom political struggles, the rise and fall of Empires, and the fate of dynasties may seem things remote from the ordinary joys and the ordinary sufferings of common life; but even to them, and perhaps more to them than to others, the fate which has overtaken the Duke of Clarence must have appealed with overwhelming pathos. Thus it is, Sir, that we, the Commons of England, have taken this first opportunity of expressing our sympathy with the Queen, not merely because we had looked forward with perfect assurance to the manner in which the Duke of Clarence would have fulfilled the great functions which seemed at one time in all probability likely to be entrusted to him, but also because we mourn with the Royal Family the death of the son, the grandson, the brother, and with one who was about to be united in even closer and tenderer relations to a member of the august family. We know that the loss has left the hearts and lives of many desolate in whose welfare we, the representatives of the people of Great Britain, take the deepest interest; and therefore it is, Sir, that we have with unanimity ventured to lay before the Throne our expression of heartfelt sympathy, knowing, though we do, that in these matters sympathy can do little, although it is the sympathy of the nation. One other subject I cannot forbear to touch upon, and I am emboldened to do so by the example which has been set both by my hon. Friends behind me and the right hon. Gentleman opposite. When last this House separated we had every ground for believing and hoping that the place of Leader of the House would on our re-assembling be filled by the well-known figure of Mr. Smith, by whom we had been so long and so ably led, and by whom our debates had been guided with such admirable tact, discretion and wisdom. It has happened otherwise, and the duties which he so well fulfilled have fallen upon one who, at all events, whatever his other shortcomings may be, desires nothing more earnestly than to walk in the footsteps of his prede-

*Sir William Harcourt*

cessors. But though I do not desire, and think it would be inappropriate, to say one word on this occasion as to what Mr. Smith's loss has been to the Party, and especially to those who sit on this Bench; though I feel that it is not desirable to bring in the question of personal friendship and to dwell in public upon the loss we have personally sustained in the removal of one who was always ready with sympathy, advice and counsel, I still may be permitted to speak what I think will be the sentiments of hon. Gentlemen on all sides of the House as to his claims upon the admiration not of the Party merely to which he belonged, but upon the House at large. Those who think with me that to have any share in the conduct of the business of this Assembly is to have an opportunity, not merely of serving your Party, not merely of serving your country, but of doing something to raise the dignity or to maintain the position of Parliamentary institutions throughout the world, will agree with me in thinking that Mr. Smith, who died after all in the service of this House, has even more than the majority of the great line of his predecessors done his duty in maintaining the dignity and in promoting the usefulness of the greatest Representative Assembly in the world. I pass from these topics to the larger portion of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, which was concerned, I will not say with the Speech from the Throne, for he made few and scanty references to that, but in attacking the speeches made outside this House by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman was pleased to express surprise at some of the omissions which were made in the Queen's Speech. I feel some surprise at the omissions made in the speech in which he dealt with them. I had anticipated from what had fallen from distinguished colleagues of his own during the recess, though not from himself, that some comment would be made upon the paragraph about Egypt. I am glad to find that is not so, and I presume I may broadly take it that as the right hon. Gentleman has made no unfavourable comment on the para-

graph, he feels himself in general agreement with the attitude taken up by Her Majesty's Government upon this difficult and important question. The right hon. Gentleman, however, did not even pay a passing reference to any question of foreign affairs. He skipped lightly over the various important items dealt with in the earlier part of the speech, and he fastened at once on the sentence which refers to a measure to be introduced by my right hon. Friend in relation to the re-arrangement come to between the Government and the Bank of England. That sentence correctly describes the character of the measure which my right hon. Friend hopes to introduce. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman and his friends will be able to raise upon that all questions they think fit connected with currency questions; and my right hon. Friend himself will take the opportunity of giving to the House, and through the House to the country, a free exposition of his views upon the subject. But I fail to understand why the right hon. Gentleman has chosen to fall foul of my right hon. Friend on this occasion. The Bill is not before us in any shape.

SIR W. HARCOURT: It ought to be.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We cannot introduce a Bill before the Queen's Speech is disposed of. All that we have any cognisance of are the views which my right hon. Friend has put forward in one or two speeches upon the subject of the banking reserve and the currency. Why is my right hon. Friend to be attacked for making those speeches? It is perfectly true that Sir Robert Peel, as the right hon. Gentleman has told the House, did not make his scheme known to the public before he introduced it to the House of Commons, and what was the result. The result was that the banking world promptly attacked him for not having taken them into his confidence or consulted them and asked their opinions upon a subject which affected their interests, and on which they thought they were entitled to speak. On a subject permanently difficult, on which there are necessarily some divergence of interests, some divergence of views, my right hon.

Friend did well to explain his general attitude, and lay certain suggestions before the mercantile and banking community for their consideration, and there can be no more fitting preparation for discussions in this House of measures of that kind than the sort of preliminary debate that has gone on out of doors on the initiative of my right hon. Friend. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to attack us for showing no zeal for a District Councils Bill to complete the policy of English Local Government so successfully initiated three years ago by the head of the Local Government Board. Well, the right hon. Gentleman is as good a judge of the capacity of this House to pass rapidly through its legislative work, and he can form as good a forecast as anyone else of the time it may take to pass the various measures mentioned in the Queen's Speech. The right hon. Gentleman is in specially favourable circumstances for prophecy, seeing that his own conduct will probably have a good deal to do with the way the prophecy turns out. Can it be maintained that the Government would have been justified in speaking in a tone of assured confidence of the passage of a District Councils Bill when they had before that Bill the Irish Local Government Bill, the Irish Education Bill, a Small Holdings Bill, an Indian Councils Bill, Private Bill Procedure, and other matters of equal importance. The Indian Councils Bill, I trust, will take no time, and I may omit that from the catalogue. Not one of the measures I have named ought to give way to a District Councils Bill, important though it undoubtedly is. If we are justified in putting before the District Councils Bill the long list of measures which I have enumerated, it would be the height of folly to pretend confidence that the Bill was sure to pass before the House separates in August. I suppose, by long prescription and tradition, Governments are justified in taking a very rosy view of the progress of legislation. Their anticipations, as far as my experience goes, have never erred on the pessimistic side. They have always taken an optimistic view; but even the optimism of the most optimistic Government never went the

length that the right hon. Gentleman desires in supposing that they were sure to pass into law so long, so complicated, or so controversial a measure as that which my right hon. Friend will be prepared to introduce should any opportunity present itself. Having disposed as he thought of the out-of-door speeches the right hon. Gentleman proceeded to attack those made by the Prime Minister. I do not believe that there is a single sentence in the last twenty minutes which had even the thinnest reference to any measures mentioned in the Queen's Speech. It was an attack upon the Prime Minister and the Liberal Unionists, a familiar subject with the right hon. Gentleman, but an unusual one to introduce into the first speech from the Front Opposition Bench in discussing the Speech from the Throne. What were his accusations? He said the Prime Minister sneered at the poor because, forsooth, he did not anticipate that the result of the establishment of District Councils would be to prevent the emigration of the agricultural labourers from the rural districts to the urban. Off the platform, and uninspired by the rhetorical influence of a public meeting, would any man in his senses ever suppose that the establishment of a District Council or a Parish Council either—whatever merits it might have—would have the particular merit of inducing a man to stay in such a district when he could get better employment and improve his condition by leaving it? Surely such an idea never entered into the heart of man, though it has sometimes appeared in the perorations of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. If that be the opinion of the House, and if that be the opinion of the Prime Minister, is he not to be allowed to express that fact without being accused by the right hon. Gentleman of sneering at the poor? Let me tell the right hon. Gentleman that to sneer at the poor is one thing, and to sneer at the nostrums put forward under certain circumstances by certain quack politicians is quite another, and the distinction is one which should not be lost sight of. Then, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman went on to deal with Local Government. Here again, on the subject of Local Government in Ireland,

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

the right hon. Gentleman in his speech devoted his attention to what the Prime Minister said—not on the subject of Local Government in Ireland—in the speech which he recently delivered at Exeter. I did not know that that speech of the Prime Minister was to be the subject of our debate to-night, and I did not furnish myself with a copy of it, and I can only judge of the accuracy of the right hon. Gentleman's attack by the version which he himself has given of it. It seems to me that, on the right hon. Gentleman's own showing, he did the Prime Minister the greatest injustice, and subjected him to the gravest misrepresentation. He read out, in the last part of his speech, perfectly fairly, an extract from the Prime Minister's speech, in which the Prime Minister is reported to have said that the majority in Ireland contains all that is most backward in the population. The right hon. Gentleman takes that phrase, and he twists it round until it comes, in his hands, to mean that the majority in Ireland is identical with all that is backward in Ireland. It is not a matter of attack upon any section of the Irish people; it is a question of fact. Is it or is it not true that in the majority—in the political majority of Ireland—are to be found the greater part of the population, of whom, by any test which ordinarily is applied to such matters would be described as the backward part of it? Now, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman himself read out an extract from an earlier speech of Lord Salisbury, in which he expressed agreement, in which he distinctly implied the same thing; because in that extract from his earlier speech Lord Salisbury pointed out that though a large portion of the people of Ireland are undoubtedly backward it is not to be attributed to this cause; so that the right hon. Gentleman himself does admit that a large portion of the majority of the population of Ireland are backward; and I think that he would hardly deny that amongst the population which is backward the greater number would be found to vote for the principles represented by the majority of the Irish Members in this House. Now, this is a plain matter of fact, and it is a matter of

fact which cannot be got rid of, the importance of which cannot be over-rated, because if the result of Home Rule—God forbid that I should follow the right hon. Gentleman and discuss Home Rule on this occasion—if the result of Home Rule were to put the more prosperous and less backward part of the population under the control of the less prosperous and more backward part of the population, and if the political divisions of Ireland happened to coincide—as they do not coincide, so far as I know, in any other country in the world—with the divisions of which I have been speaking, the result would be, or might be—we think it would be—that the prosperous, advancing, and progressive minority might have their interests seriously imperilled by the action of those who, as a matter of fact, are less prosperous and more backward. Now, Sir, I do not mention this mere matter of statistical fact in order to excite or embitter feeling. I mention it simply to correct the right hon. Gentlemen's rhetoric, and show that in alluding to it the Prime Minister did not intend to embitter controversy, or to insult any section of the Irish people. He intended to bring to the notice of the electors of this country a fact which they are too often apt to forget, and it is that there is such a place in Ireland as Ulster, and that Ulster is not a place whose claims, whose rights, and whose future, ought to be lightly imperilled by the action of this House. With regard to what the right hon. Gentleman has said about embittering religious differences, I confess that my own opinion was that the only speech which has been delivered on this subject which was likely to embitter religious differences was the speech of the right hon. Gentleman himself. He evidently took into review every sentence of Lord Salisbury which could be twisted, perverted, or contorted into an attack upon those who profess the Roman Catholic religion, and in order that he might himself embitter for Party purposes the feelings of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland. For my own part I can, I think, safely say that never in all the controversies in which I have against my will been compelled to take part on the Irish

question, never have I suggested anything which it has been alleged against me could be turned into an attack upon the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, as such. Nor do I believe that anything that ever has fallen from the Prime Minister is capable of a similar interpretation. But I recollect that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, some 15 or 20 years ago, did engage in a controversy upon the Roman Catholic question, in which he made statements of Roman Catholics as such, and the impossibility of their being good citizens, which might well cause offence, and deep offence, in the mind of every Roman Catholic. But I do not believe that a single word can be attributed to Lord Salisbury which would indicate that, in his opinion, because a man happened to be a Roman Catholic he either [was, or was likely to be, a less loyal subject or a less good subject of these realms. Sir, I have to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman took any precaution that a speech like the one he has just made would be delivered in the House of Lords, where it could be answered by the person whom it chiefly concerns. I presume that the leading members of the right hon. Gentleman's Party met, as it is customary upon these occasions, in order to discuss what line was to be taken in the Debate on the Address. I presume, then, that the right hon. Gentleman told his colleagues that he proposed devoting three-fourths of his oration to an attack on a speech made at a public meeting outside the walls of Parliament by a Peer; and I presume that the Leader of the right hon. Gentleman's Party in the House of Lords immediately said to him—"You have a perfect right to do what you like in the House of Commons; but clearly the most appropriate place for this attack is the House of Lords. There the Prime Minister will be able to explain and defend his action. I will repeat to the best of my ability your point if you will allow me, and then we shall know exactly what it is the Prime Minister did mean, and what is the policy he presented." I have no information from the other House as to when that step was taken. I can only regret that the duty, and I may

add the pleasure, of replying to the right hon. Gentleman has fallen into my unworthy hands, and that he could not be immediately promoted to a sphere which I am sure he would adorn, in order that he might have at first hand a reply which I am sure would have a very convincing effect upon the right hon. Gentleman and his friends. As to the concluding observations which the right hon. Gentleman made about the causes of prosperity in Ireland and the mode by which we think the Imperial Parliament may best reach the goal which we all desire to attain, I have only to say that if I believed, as the right hon. Gentleman here believes, that in the policy which he has advocated lie the best hopes of public security and personal liberty, I would join the right hon. Gentleman's Party. It is because I believe just the contrary; it is because I believe that the Whigs, whose memory he has revived to-day, would have thought as we think, that the liberty and security of the individual is incomparably safer under the ægis of the Imperial Parliament than they could be under the guardianship—if guardianship is the word—of a Parliament in Dublin, be the safeguards by which you are going to secure them what you like. It is because I believe that all the best men of all parties in England would have held that view that I myself am determined now, and always, to do my best to resist that policy which the right hon. Gentleman has thought fit, without, so far as I see, any rhyme or reason, to discuss upon the present occasion. I will not travel further upon the road which he has pursued. It is enough that I feel myself justified in concluding, from the silence which the right hon. Gentleman maintained, both upon that part of the Speech which refers to foreign affairs and upon that part of it which refers to domestic legislation, that, so far, at all events, on these points, he sees little to criticise or blame in our action. I think that is a conclusion which I am warranted in drawing from the right hon. Gentleman's speech; and that being so, it is not necessary for me, I think, to follow him further into the very controversial matter which he could not restrain himself from making

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

allusion to towards the latter part of his address. I hope I may take the right hon. Gentleman's observations upon the topics really raised in the Queen's Speech as some indication that the debate on the Address will not be of a very prolonged or acrimonious character, and that it is not on this occasion that we need anticipate any of those formal debates to which the Speech from the Throne has occasionally given rise. There is one question which the right hon. Gentleman put to me, and to which I will endeavour to give some reply. He asked me whether the Irish Local Government Bill would be read a second time before Easter. It is impossible for me to give any absolute pledge upon that subject. My hope is to introduce that Bill and the other leading Bills of the Government at the very earliest date, so as to give the very fullest opportunity to the House and the country of seeing their provisions. Then I hope we shall make rapid progress with the Bill of my right hon. Friend dealing with small holdings, and as soon as that Bill is in an advanced condition, not necessarily completed, I propose to read the Irish Local Government Bill a second time, and to proceed with that and other measures. The Bill will be introduced at once, immediately this debate is over. I hope that assurance, which the right hon. Gentleman will feel is as much as it is possible for me to give on the present occasion, will satisfy him and satisfy all the Members of the House.

\*(852.) MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I rise to call the attention of the House to a single paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, namely, that which deals with the re-introduction of the Bill for improving the Legislative Councils of India. I congratulate the Government in determining to deal with this important question, which is very well understood in India but very little understood in this House or in this country. This Indian Councils Bill, if adequately handled, will mark the most important stage in the government of India which has taken place since the beginning of the direct rule of the Crown. It is high time this Bill should be seriously dealt with. Great dissatisfaction exists in India at

the delay which has taken place, and I hope the Government will place this Bill in the front rank of the measures which they mean to pass this Session, and will give us an opportunity of considering it before Easter. But if this Bill is to effect the purpose of conciliation, it should mark a very considerable advance on the previous Bills brought in by the Government. If it goes no further than these, I venture to think it will altogether fail to pacify the educated opinion of India, or to have that healthy influence which we all hope it will ultimately exert. The previous Bills were limited to the extension of the Indian Legislative Council by increasing the number of nominated members. A larger number of native members were to be nominated by the respective Governments. Sir, as one in close contact with the educated opinion of India, and fairly acquainted with the progress of events there, I am bound to say that unless the elective principle is in some way, some substantial way, introduced into this Bill, it will altogether fail to satisfy the people, or fulfil those purposes of better government which we all hope to bring about. What India needs is some authentic means of expressing its wishes to its rulers, and to get an authentic means it is absolutely necessary that we should concede in some form the principle of representation. What we want in India is independent criticism of the action of the Government in India. All Governments are better for being criticised, and most of all despotic and autocratic Governments, as our Government in India virtually is. It is impossible to get this criticism merely by means of nominated members, who cannot adequately represent the wishes and demands of the people. No measure would tend more to give stability to our rule in India, or give solidity to our Empire, than the establishment in India of a measure of representative government. There are in India nearly as many University graduates as there are in England. For several years great representative assemblies have been held in India, under the name of the Indian National Congress. Every one who has read the proceedings

of that body will allow that for wisdom, moderation, and loyalty, they would do credit to this Parliament itself, or to any Legislative Assembly in the world. Now, Sir, this National Indian Congress is a very great political factor, a factor of the first magnitude; it cannot be ignored. It has raised in the most moderate and constitutional manner serious demands, and the principal of these—it may be said to lie at the basis of all the others—is one for elective representation on the great Councils of India. That is a loyal and constitutional demand which we must deal with sympathetically, if we wish to retain the goodwill of the large body of the people of India. Unless we do so we are preparing for ourselves a time of trouble in India, when seditious agitation may take the place of constitutional action. It would be immensely better to meet the natives of India half way. There is no use in disguising the fact that our Government of India is a species of despotism, as was plainly stated last Session by the former Under Secretary (Sir John Gorst). It is quite impossible that this system of government can continue in the nineteenth century, for it is absolutely out of harmony with those principles of which we are so proud in this country, and which we have applied to all our colonial dependencies, with the effect of making them thoroughly loyal. I admit that no one would think of placing the population of India on the same footing as the people of Canada or Australia; but there are in India a large number of educated persons who, by means of electoral machinery, might give great help in the government of the country. I am not proposing anything wild or revolutionary, but only what Lord Dufferin was in favour of before he left India. He declared that—

"The time had come to give a still wider share in the administration of Indian public affairs to such Indian gentlemen as by their influence and acquirements, and the confidence they had inspired in their fellow-countrymen, were fitted to assist in the government of the country. Our scheme is a plan for the enlargement of Provincial Councils, and the multiplication of their functions by a partial introduction of the elective principle;"

and if the Bill which we hope to see in-

*Mr. Samuel Smith*

roduced before long carries out this recommendation of one of the ablest Governor Generals we have ever had in India, it will go a long way towards satisfying the aspirations of the Indian people. The burden of the responsibility we have assumed in India is almost too heavy for any country to bear. We have constituted ourselves as a kind of national providence over 280,000,000 of people, and it is to our real interest to associate with ourselves a body of competent and able Indian gentlemen who will share with us this immense responsibility. I wish now to allude to the decisive condemnation of the opium trade passed by this House on the 10th of April last. That vote, I believe, truly expresses the feelings of the British people with regard to the whole subject; for none can doubt that there has been a growing feeling of uneasiness and discomfort in the conscience of the country in respect of the opium trade. The agitation is bound to go on until a totally different policy has been adopted. My hon. Friend (Mr. Curzon), who has assumed the responsibility of representing India in this House, and for whom I have nothing but the kindest and best wishes, will agree with me, I am sure, when I say that there is no chance that the people of this country will change the view which has been expressed in this House upon the character of the opium traffic. I rejoice to hear within the last few days that the Indian Government has promulgated, or is about to promulgate, a prohibition of all opium smoking dens, and we shall look upon that as a great victory in the cause of righteousness. It is a great gain, but it falls far short of all that is expected from the Government of India, and only touches the fringe of the subject. It will help some of the people of India; but what will it do to protect the multitudes of Chinese? There is only one way of dealing with the opium traffic that will satisfy the people of this country, and that is its abolition, so far as the power of the law will allow. I admit that this seems hardly possible to do at once, and I do not wish to press the Government for any hasty decision on the subject. I am aware that India is a miserably poor country, and is heavily taxed upon that necessary of life—salt—by a duty

equal to 1,600 per cent. upon its prime cost; and I am also aware that India is not able to bear the loss of the revenue it at present draws from the opium trade, nor would I advocate that we should throw upon India so huge a financial deficit. If we are to tackle this opium question in a broad and statesmanlike way, looking to its ultimate abolition, this country must be prepared to give temporary aid to India, and to make some sacrifice itself. I am opposed to saddling the cost of the abolition of this traffic upon the poor, half-starved millions of India, and I trust the Government will before long be able to make some comprehensive statement dealing with the whole question of the opium trade. Before sitting down I wish to say that I hope this expiring Session of a long Parliament may not be wasted in Party strife, but will be devoted to measures of lasting benefit to the people of this country.

(9.10.) COLONEL EYRE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough Division): We have been engaged this evening in expressing our sympathy with Her Majesty and the Royal Family in their recent bereavement, and I should like to extend that expression of sympathy to all those sorts and conditions of men who form the poorer classes in this country, and suffer as much as other classes, but have no means of participating in an expression of national sympathy, except through the House of Commons. I refer to those whose advent to, and exit from, this world is perhaps known only to the Registrar of the district; but I feel that I am expressing the feeling of the whole House in making this allusion. In regard to the most Gracious Speech from the Throne, I find the stereotyped expression that we are at peace with all the world. It has become so common within the last few years that we look for it as a matter of annual certainty; but perhaps we do not realize how difficult has been the position of the Foreign Office during the last few years. We see Europe one armed camp. From the north of Russia to the south of Italy every man either is, or has been, a soldier. All the laboratories in Europe are devoting their time to the elaboration of methods of destruction of human life; yet, by some powerful

hand, these nations have been prevented from flying at each other's throats. We may congratulate ourselves that the gates of the Temple of Janus are still closed, and that the dogs of war are not yet let loose upon the Continent. In olden times, Sovereigns used to consult their augurs as to the probabilities of the future. In these more prosaic days we consult the Money Market; and, looking to that, I think we may anticipate a time of prolonged peace. But I attribute a great deal of this peace to the position our country has taken up during the last few years. Being a great commercial nation, representing three-fifths of the carrying power of the whole world, the Government have recognised the necessity for protecting its waterways through which the trade and commerce of this country comes; and I believe that in increasing the strength of our Navy we have increased the security of our national trade, and tended enormously to secure the peace of the world. I am glad to find that the Government are going to introduce a Local Government Bill for Ireland, and I can only trust that it will be framed in the same generous spirit as the English Local Government Bill. But I feel that it is the exceptionally prosperous and peaceable condition of Ireland at the present time which enables the Government to bring forward this Bill, and I hope the result of its introduction will be to secure still more the prosperity of that country. From the gracious Speech of Her Majesty I find that the Government intend to bring in a Bill to increase the discipline of the Established Church in dealing with moral offences; but I wish the discipline to be extended still further, for my experience teaches me that in the Church of England there is not that order that should be maintained. In the Army and Navy, discipline is very strict, and disobedience to orders is visited as it should be; and I think some method should be adopted by means of which, in cases where the ministers in charge of parishes neglect to perform their duties in a proper and satisfactory manner, the Bishop should be able to interfere and bring them to a sense of duty without incurring the enormous



expense which at present such proceedings involve. I trust that all the Bills mentioned in this gracious Speech from the Throne will receive the assent of the House, for I find they are all in the interest and for the benefit of the nation.

\*MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, North Division): I should not have taken part in this debate had not the hon. Member below me referred to the subject of India; but I should like to say a few words on that subject. I was glad to notice in the Queen's Speech a reference to bringing in the Indian Councils Bill: that I am sure will be considered as a sign of interest in their affairs by the 280,000,000 of our fellow-subjects in India. Of course, it will depend upon what that Bill contains whether it meets the wishes of those on this side of the House, who have interested themselves in the welfare of the Indian people. The Bill of last Session was produced only to be withdrawn, and we trust the Government have not the same intention of strangling their bantling this year, and that it will contain, in some decided shape, the elective principle. The members of the Indian National Congress do not wish to dogmatise by proposing the exact method in which representation should be provided for, and leave that to the Viceroy and the Viceregal Council; but if the Bill is to be at all commensurate to the aspirations of the Indian people it must contain the representative principle. In the Queen's Speech no mention is made of the intended abolition of the paddy or rice tax in Ceylon, yet from the attitude taken by the Government last year it was clear they were convinced that the paddy tax ought to be abolished. It was then shown that the Governor of Ceylon favoured the abolition of this tax, which is imposed on the rice fields in which rice, the first necessity, as far as food is concerned, of the Cingalese people, is grown, and I believe Her Majesty's Government intended to remove it; but I shall be glad to hear what are their intentions, as whilst the fields which produce rice are taxed the lands on which tea, coffee, cocoa-nuts and other valuable crops are raised, are free from taxation. I am glad to see the

principle of arbitration laid down for approval with reference to the Fisheries Question; yet although we all approve of the action of the Government in letting that knotty question be laid before arbitrators, we shall be glad to see the whole question of arbitration taken up by Her Majesty's Ministers. The Government of the United States has expressed its approval of that principle, and there is no doubt that any advances made by Her Majesty's Government to the United States Government would meet with cordial consideration, and that a noble example might be set which would be followed by other nations. The working men of England are becoming convinced that arbitration is one of the means by which our commerce may be stimulated.

(9.25.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I can assure the hon. Member that there is every desire to push forward the Bill to which he has referred at an early date, and to carry it into law, and that intention is indicated by the position that it now for the first time assumes. It will be introduced by the Secretary of State for India in the House of Lords on the earliest possible opportunity, and there is no reason why it should not come down to this House at a comparatively early date. I share the hon. Member's desire that we may secure an early second reading of the Bill. I think I should be unwise—and I am not certain that I should be in order—if I were on this occasion to follow the hon. Member into a discussion on the provisions of the Bill, which it will fall to my lot to introduce; and I will merely say that if it does not satisfy the expectations of the hon. Member in all respects, it, at any rate, is, from our point of view, an attempt to deal seriously with the question, and I hope we may receive his assistance with regard to it. The other matter to which the hon. Member alluded was the opium question; but here, again, I must not follow him in his observations upon the general policy of the Government of India, for they were hardly germane to a discussion of the Queen's Speech. I will only say, therefore, that I have laid this afternoon upon the Table, and

it will be shortly in the hands of hon. Members, a despatch from the Government of India dealing with this question, and relating to the representations of the Secretary of State on the subject. That despatch will in one particular, the importance of which I am glad to find admitted by the hon. Member, fulfil the expectations indulged in by him; and even if it does not meet with the entire approval of those who take more extreme views than the Government of India can espouse, it will still mark the development on the part of the Government of India of that policy of curtailment and restriction of the opium traffic, to which, from this bench, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs gave expression last year. With regard to the question of the paddy tax, I would suggest that the hon. Member should put the question he desires to be answered upon the Paper.

\*(9.30.) SIR CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.): I would ask permission of the House for a brief period to make some answer to the speech delivered by the Leader of the House. He has complained of the admirable speech delivered by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, that that right hon. Gentleman discussed an ex-Parliamentary speech of the Prime Minister. He seemed to suggest that that was not proper Parliamentary usage in a discussion on the Queen's Speech. I submit that the course he took is amply justified by precedent, and that nothing—in view of the legislative programme of the Government, one of whose principal measures is the question of Local Government for Ireland—can be more fair than the discussion of the pronouncements of the Government out of Parliament on topics germane to that programme. It is of consequence to know whether the Local Government is to proceed on broad and generous lines in reference to the Irish people, even if it fall short of the point of the creation of a legislative body, which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham approves; whether it is to be a distorted, confined, contracted measure as defined in the ex-Parliamentary speeches of such Members as the hon. Member for South Tyrone and other Members for Ulster sitting on that side of the House. The right hon.

Gentleman the Leader of the House says he has not in his mind very clearly, and he has not read very earnestly and closely, the speech of the Prime Minister. That was convenient, for it enabled him to give a gloss, to suggest a gloss, on that speech which makes it entirely different from what it really was. What does he suggest would be the effect of that speech? That Lord Salisbury at Exeter hardly did more than point out to the people of Exeter that there was a place in Ireland called Ulster. It speaks rather strongly of the view Lord Salisbury took of the intelligence of his Exeter audience, if it was necessary to point out that fact. What are the consequences that follow from this statement of the Leader of the House? When Lord Salisbury talked of the minority in Ireland as being that portion of the country which contained all that was progressive and enlightened, he meant that that was Ulster. Let us follow this to a conclusion. According to Lord Salisbury Ulster contains all the light, all that is progressive, all that is not priest-ridden in Ireland. ["No, no!"] I am glad the hon. Gentleman does not agree with that; but I am quoting the Leader of the House. Yet Ulster returns to this House—that which contains all the progression and enlightenment—a majority of Nationalist Members. This is in the speech of Lord Salisbury, as I read it:—He divides Ireland into two parts, and the division is not geographical; it is religious. They are divisions into Catholic Ireland and Protestant Ireland, and to the first of these divisions he attributes want of enlightenment, and the absence of all the elements of progress and civilisation; to the second he attributes all the civic virtues. The first of these divisions he denounces as the traditional enemies of England; for the second he claims the exclusive possession of that much desired and much misunderstood quality of loyalty. That was the division which Lord Salisbury emphatically made. I repeat, it is convenient that the Leader of the House has not had an opportunity of reading that speech at length, or of having any very clear recollection of what its contents were. We, on this side of the House, rejoice when the Prime Minister

does speak in public. Lord Salisbury, with all his great ability and the charms of his eloquence, is never anything in public if not contemptuous. If he has to deal with a question affecting India there is a suggestion of the black man; if with the question of Parish Councils there is the suggestion that a circus would be much more on their lines. If he refers to Irishmen, the "Hottentot" comparison rises to his lips. On this occasion he has denounced that division of the Irish people which he calls the unprogressive and unenlightened one, as the Catholic section. Does it occur to the supporters of the noble Lord, if it be true that the majority of the Irish people are not enlightened, are not civilized, have not the principles or elements of progress amongst them, does it occur to the supporters of the noble Lord what a sad, what a severe commentary it is on the Government of Ireland by the English people? There have been very nearly a hundred years of English rule, and yet at the end of it the Prime Minister is able to say no more than this of its results! One is almost inclined to believe, as has been suggested, that after all Lord Salisbury is an earnest Home Ruler in disguise, and that he takes this cynical way of pointing out the results of past English misgovernment in Ireland in order to bring home to the comprehension of the English people the vice and failure of their system. Yet it is to the majority of these people so denounced on whom he proposes to confer the boon of Local Government, on the same lines, according to the Mover and Seconder of the Address, on the same principles on which that Local Government is extended to England and Scotland. I ask, at the outset, Is it wise, is it statesmanlike, that such utterances should proceed from the mouth of the head of the Government, practically, of this great Empire; an Empire in which in many parts the Catholic population forms a very important portion? Is it wise, is it just to the Catholics of the Empire, to the Catholic Members of your Civil Service at home and abroad, to the Catholics who are amongst your diplomatists, amongst your representatives as Consuls, who have served in large numbers as your sailors and soldiers—is it wise and just to them that such a

division should be made? Is it just to that large body of Catholic servants of the Crown and Empire, faithful servants who in the days of danger and battle have not proved cowards or unfaithful? As a Catholic and as an Irishman I take as an insult the attack which the Prime Minister made, and that for the poor purpose of attracting the cheers of the groundlings, or for the wider purpose of influencing a Party vote. The Prime Minister further said that the majority were always the enemies of England, and he goes back to the story of the assistance that was given to Spain, to France, and to America. Was that statesmanlike, was it just? What says an historian, whose authority will be received by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite? Speaking of that very Spanish epoch, Mr. Froude says—

"It cannot be said that England deserved to keep a country (that is Ireland) which it mismanaged so disastrously. The Irish were not to be blamed if they looked to the Pope, to Spain, to France, or to any other power in Heaven or in earth to deliver them from the Government which discharged no single duty that rulers owe to subjects."

That was in reference to 1570, the epoch referred to by Lord Salisbury. He then refers to the assistance given to France, to the fact that Irish soldiers had fought in the French ranks. The fact is true, but so is the fact that these soldiers, gallant men, at the time they were fighting under the banner of France had been expelled from Ireland under the oppression of penal laws, which drove them from a country in which they were denied the rights of citizenship. Lastly, he refers to America, but surely this was the gravest mistake of all? In the discussion, by Lord Salisbury, of Home Rule, to introduce the case of America, of the fight of the American Colonies for independence, and to blame the Irish for taking part in the assertion of American rights, could any blunder be greater in any discussion of Home Rule? What was the story of the policy of the Home Government of that day, the stupid policy, which wrested from the English Crown and Empire those Colonies which might have long remained under her sway if there had been conceded to them by the Home Government, what they had a right to, self-government in their

*Sir Charles Russell*

own land in matters relating to their own affairs. Yes, the Irish did lend assistance, and they are not ashamed of it. They are proud of it, and my only regret is that I cannot claim for the Catholic people of Ireland any important share in that effort. It was not the Catholic people of Ireland who rendered important assistance in the assertion of national right on the part of the American people to deal, in their own land, by the voice of their own people, in matters of their own concern. It was the tenants—the evicted tenants—of Ulster, the sturdy Presbyterians and Protestants of Ulster, who were the men who fought in the American ranks. Lord Salisbury is not content with this; he charges generally against the Catholic people of Ireland, because these are the two divisions he makes; not the division of Lord Robert Cecil, who, speaking in 1865, drew no religious distinctions, but drew a distinction between the class of those who were distressed and those not distressed; he charges the Catholic people generally with disloyalty; he is historically incorrect. I am not going away from facts, as Lord Salisbury did, to the sixteenth century, but to take the fight between James and William. The Irish fought for James, and he was *de facto* the lawful Sovereign. They fought for him, not because he was James, but because he was the representative as they believed of their own civil and religious rights. I see the First Lord of the Admiralty in his place, and have no doubt he is acquainted with his own genealogical tree; and I believe I am right when I say that one of the men who led the attacking forces at the siege of Derry was one of the ancestors of that important ducal house. Now, Sir, what is the fact? From the time of the violated Treaty of Limerick of 1691, when that solemn promise was made of the concession of civil and religious rights to the Irish people, till 1782 there was no political rising in Ireland at all. There were in England and in Scotland, and I do not think the Scotch people of 1715 or 1745, or any hon. Members who are descended from them, are ashamed of the part their ancestors took on these occasions; and when in 1782 there was something like a military rising in Ireland, who were the leaders

of it? A Protestant—Lord Charlemont. In 1798—for I am passing over these rapidly—who were the leaders? Protestants—Lord Edward Fitzgerald, McCrackan, Joy, and the Shearses, names familiar to the hon. Member for Belfast, and still held in honour in Ulster. In 1803 another Protestant, Robert Emmet. And when, in 1848, the agitation for repeal left the strictly constitutional platform, who were the men to the front in the attempt to redress by arms the grievances of their country? They were the Protestant Smith O'Brien, and the Ulster Presbyterian John Mitchell. There is no doubt many Catholics joined them—amongst others the Sir Charles Gavan Duffy of to-day. Why do I mention these things? Is it to suggest that there is any shame or dishonour in these men for the part they took? Far from it! All credit to them! What I regret is that there were so few Catholics to the front. The truth was that the steel of persecution had entered their souls, for if ever rebellious movements were justified, they were justified by the state of things in those days. The speech of Lord Robert Cecil in 1865 has been referred to by my right hon. Friend. That speech, dispassionate in tone, pointed out no racial or religious division, but a division into two classes, one fairly prosperous, and the other, the larger, in great distress, and he points out that that condition of things is not to be attributed to race, or religion, or the teaching of demagogues, but was to be traced to the government by England. Since those days much has been done, and what has been done, speaking of its broad outlines, has been done in spite of the policy supported by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with some warmth, because I confess I felt some indignation. Protestants have most usually condemned Catholic teaching, not because it promoted rebellion, but because it enjoined in the interests of peace and order a submissive obedience, which was sometimes called a too servile loyalty. But Catholic loyalty in its true sense is not a mere political sentiment; it is a moral duty. When all is said and done, who is there that will deny that the best and surest foundation of all loyalty is a sense of confidence in the people that Government is to them

not a source of worry but of protection, that they are living, as they believe and feel, under the protection of just laws justly administered. It is a truth, which the history of the world proclaims, that wherever disloyalty exists it exists because the Government against which the feeling exists is not a just, is not a protective one, and does not give to the people the sense of security. If the position of these two islands were changed, and instead of Ireland being mainly Catholic it were mainly Protestant, and instead of England being mainly Protestant it were mainly Catholic, and if from Catholic England you sent Catholics to administer the Government of Protestant Ireland, thus placing the majority of the country in a position of inferiority to the minority, and reversing the universal rule by treating the majority and their views as not worthy of acceptance in the government of their country, I wonder how long hon. Gentlemen opposite would have been content with these ineffectual efforts to obtain their rights. The spirits of such men as my amiable Friend opposite (Mr. Johnston) would have risen against such a state of things. And who is there in the class to which he belongs who would not have struggled constitutionally and unconstitutionally till they had secured the rational right of self-government in their own affairs? Mr. Speaker, the language which Lord Salisbury has uttered would have been a mistake in any man, a mistake in any politician, and it is not too strong to say it is a shame and disgrace in a Prime Minister.

\*(10.0.) Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Thanet Division of Kent): The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down has opened up a phase of the discussion which is very tempting; but I feel bound to refrain from it on the present occasion, because I think it is generally understood that we shall have more than one opportunity of discussing Irish affairs before the debate is ended. My object in asking the indulgence of the House for a few minutes is with a view of bringing before it and before Her Majesty's Government another and very important subject. I desire to move as an Amendment the following addition to the Address:—

*Sir Charles Russell*

"But, while glad to learn that your Majesty's relations with Foreign Powers continue friendly, this House deploras the relation in certain Treaties with Foreign States of provisions which operate in restraint of the establishment of preferential trading relations amongst the several portions of Her Majesty's Empire, and humbly urges the early termination of such provisions in accordance with the prayer contained in the Address to your Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, supported by the representatives in this country of other self-governing Colonies."

I think I should be unnecessarily detaining the House if I were to enter upon any lengthened explanation as to the reasons which induced me to bring forward this question. The remarks contained in the Amendment, to the effect that the two Houses of the Canadian Legislature have addressed a prayer to the Crown for the abrogation of the Treaties in question, is, I think, ample reason why not one moment should be lost in bringing this matter under the notice of the Imperial Parliament. In fact, if I have any expression of regret to make on the subject, it would be of regret and surprise that a matter is left to a private Member to bring forward which should rather have been introduced to the notice of the House by Her Majesty's Ministers themselves. The Treaties to which I refer are the Treaties entered into between this country and Belgium in 1862 and that entered into with Germany in 1865, and which, when combined with what are known as "favoured nation clauses" in other Treaties in operation with other countries, extend the provisions of the Belgian and German Treaties to all other countries with which we have commercial engagements. These Treaties especially prevented any arrangement for preferential treatment being entered into for commercial purposes between the mother country and her colonies. By the action of the Government some 30 years ago in entering into these Treaties with Foreign Powers the freedom of the mother country to enter into such commercial relations with her colonies as might be for their mutual benefit has been fettered. If these Treaties are to be maintained, I do not think that the connection between England and her Colonies would be worth many years' purchase, for this is the only Empire that has

given foreigners the right to interfere in its own private and domestic concerns. The fact that the Address to the Crown, which I have already alluded to, praying for the abrogation of the Treaties, was passed by both Houses of the Canadian Legislature, would, under any circumstances, possess great weight with this House; but when I mention the fact that in each Chamber this Address was moved by a responsible Member of the Government, and seconded and supported by leading Members of the Opposition, and that the Motion passed unanimously, I think it will at once be recognised that the matter especially demands our consideration. Party politics have run somewhat high in Canada, and fiscal questions have entered very largely into those politics; but notwithstanding that fact, they have unanimously agreed to urge this question upon Her Majesty's Ministers, the Address having been voted unanimously. It contained the following:—

"That your Memorialists consider that these Treaties with Foreign Powers are incompatible with the powers and privileges that have been conferred upon the Canadian Legislature, and that their continuance in force is calculated to produce complications and embarrassment in the fiscal relations between England and her Colonies,"

and so on; and then they go on to say—

"That your Memorialists further believe that none of Her Majesty's self-governing Colonies should be restricted in adopting modifications,"

and so on. But we must recollect that Canada does not stand alone in these views; because she is supported in her prayer for abrogation of those treaties by the accredited representatives of all our self-governing colonies. These have added their voice to the voice of Canada, and they one and all protest against the continuance of treaties which hamper the action of the Colonial Legislatures; those Colonial Legislatures having been in no way consulted or made acquainted with the treaties to which I have referred. The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down has spoken of the action of Lord North in connection with the fiscal arrangements of the United States of America. Are we again going to play the rôle of Lord North; are we going

to turn a deaf ear to the united voice of the Dominion of Canada in this matter? I hope we shall hear from Her Majesty's Ministers that Her Majesty's Government are about to take prompt steps for the purpose of putting an end to this very substantial grievance. I cannot but hope that we shall hear that Her Majesty's Government have resolved upon that course, because last year it fell to my lot amongst others to be received on a deputation by the Prime Minister upon this subject, and the Prime Minister then spoke of "these unlucky treaties." He said—

"With respect to those two unlucky treaties made by Lord Palmerston's Government 30 years ago, I am sure the matter could not have been fully considered. We have tried to find out what species of reason it was that induced Her Majesty's Government to sign such unfortunate treaties."

And again he says—

"Although there are difficulties in the way of these unfortunate engagements the Government will not omit any opportunity which may present itself for obtaining a modification of the provisions."

But since then the question has pressed on with rapid strides, because the Canadian Government did not think that it was justified in waiting for the convenient moment which has been spoken of by the Prime Minister, and which he was watching for, to obtain a removal of those commercial restrictions, and they come before this House and ask that they should be freed from such complicated engagements. I must say also that all the self-governing colonies have united with Canada in protesting against the continuance of these Treaties. It need not be supposed that the abrogation of these Treaties is urged merely upon sentimental grounds; it is urged because they prevent a comprehensive commercial policy between the Mother Country and her colonies from being carried into effect. All the leading statesmen of all the colonies have placed their opinion in reference to this question upon record, and from these opinions it may be gathered how deep is the feeling of the colonies upon the question. The late Sir John Macdonald, speaking in 1885, said—

"British federation might be achieved on the basis of give and take: if you give Colonial products such advantages as you give no other nation, I am quite sure the colonies will give British goods, and only British goods, preferential treatment."

I quote these words, because it is said by some on the other side that, though the colonies wish to get these advantages, they will give nothing in return. A well known colonial statesman has said that—

"Nothing could be of greater advantage to the unity of the Empire than the establishment of greater sympathy between the Mother Country and her colonies"

in these matters, and in fact all the distinguished Colonial statesmen, including Sir Gordon Sprigg, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, Mr. Service, Sir Samuel Griffith and others, pointed most strongly to the fact that a means of cementing the Empire could be found in these engagements of a commercial character. If we drive our colonies into commercial, and especially into reciprocal preferential arrangements with other States, I do not think anybody would give a very great number of years' purchase for the continuance of our Colonial Empire. One matter which I should like to bring before the House is this. I am not asking the House to embark upon any line of policy which would be detrimental to the inhabitants of these islands. This country requires a large, I was going to say, an inexhaustible supply of food and raw material for the consumption of the inhabitants and for the trade of this country. The British Empire extends over an area, roughly computed, of something like one-fifth of the discovered globe, and Her Majesty's subjects number about 300,000,000 souls, and the various climates and soils which are included in Her Majesty's dominions entirely preclude any notion whatever that under any circumstances there could be a simultaneous occurrence of scarcity throughout the limits of our Empire; and in asking the House to press upon Her Majesty's Government the advisability of removing those obstacles to the introduction of preferential trading relations between this country and Canada, I have regard to the interests of the people and the necessity of an inexhaustible supply both of food and raw materials. We may be told that this is contrary to the principles of Free Trade; but in that connection I wish to say that amongst those who have taken the most active part in urging the establishment of trading relations within the limits of the Empire

*Mr. James Lowther*

are some of the most staunch free traders. Many free traders have come to recognise the fact that our first duty is to decide what is best for the country at the present time, and ask themselves whether they are not justified in looking to what would be of immediate benefit to the country. I have said that some of the most staunch free traders are in favour of a full consideration of this subject; and, though I am not myself a free trader, I can point to others who have realised that they must decline to follow upon this path. We were assured that all the world would follow in our wake as free traders. What has the world done? No doubt, up to a certain point, there were steps taken in certain countries in the direction of free trade. We found steps taken in that direction by France, and, in some respects, by the United States and other countries; but we find now that, with one solitary exception—I ought to except His Highness the Sultan of Zanzibar—scarcely a single State recognises what is known as free trade—I beg pardon, there was one State alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian upon a celebrated occasion as "The one anti-human specimen of humanity," and designated by another authority as "The Unspeakable Turk," though I prefer to refer to that Power as our ancient ally the Ottoman Empire. But that is the only Power which can be quoted now as having in its system the slightest suggestion of these doctrines. But I would point out to hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite that the States of the world, united as they are against every principle of free trade, one by one, have all tried something in that direction, and one by one have abandoned it. I am not now arguing protection, although I am quite ready to do so, as I have never concealed my own predilections for a protectionist policy. I am now approaching the matter from the standpoint of an impartial trader, who desires to leave the Mother Country and the Colonies a free hand in their commercial concerns, with full liberty to advance what they conceive to be the interests of the Empire at the present time. I would point out to hon. Gentlemen opposite that the States in which the

doctrines of free trade are more thoroughly at a discount than in any other are the States in which popular government is in its most advanced state. I have never been an advocate of democracy; but I would point out that the most rigid protectionist tariffs are those of the great Republic of France, which is pointed to as a model to be copied; and in the new world I would point to the great Republic of the United States, which has shown a thorough disinclination to be hoodwinked by the arguments of the Cobden Club; and the whole world over I could show that wherever government has been established upon a wide basis, there you find free trade, more at a discount even than in Monarchical States. And in no place do we find free trade more thoroughly discountenanced and repudiated than amongst our own kith and kin in our own self-governing colonies. In all these colonies the tendency is to decline to follow our path and to strike out a policy for themselves. Therefore we are brought to this, that we are asked to reject the advances of our own colonies and to stand absolutely alone. When I speak of the United Kingdom I speak of the United Kingdom as standing against the whole world and against our own colonies. The population of the United Kingdom is about one-tenth of the population of Her Majesty's dominions, and the United Kingdom by no means forms so important a factor, relatively speaking, as it did in former days. There is another point which I would bring to the notice of the House, and especially to that of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, who has just quoted from a recent speech of the Prime Minister. I daresay the hon. and learned Gentleman noticed that part of the Prime Minister's speech in which he spoke of an attempt of the political representatives of Ireland which involved the setting up of a protectionist State upon the shores of this country. I am not going into the question of Home Rule or Separation—it is foreign to the subject—but this I do say, and the Prime Minister was perfectly correct in saying, that the people of Ireland, like the French nation when it recovered its freedom of political action,

would promptly repudiate Cobdenism, and embark upon a protectionist policy. In like manner, the people of Ireland will demand from their representatives, whether they sit in this House, or whether they should sit elsewhere, they will demand that they should redress the gross injustice which was committed on Ireland by England many years ago, namely, the extinction of their manufacturing industries in the selfish interests of Great Britain.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: That was done by English protectionists.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle says that was done by English protectionists. What I say is that the people of England, in their own selfish interests, forced it down the throats of the people of Ireland; and if the right hon. Gentleman understood what Lord Salisbury gave expression to, he would see that it was that the great mass of the people of Ireland would demand some form of what is popularly known as Protection, and would eschew the doctrines of Free Trade. I see that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby is in his place. My right hon. Friend I know has never endorsed protection, and I think is supposed to be more or less in favour of free trade, or rather that he is disposed to be in favour of it; but what I have just been mentioning leads me to entertain hopes of the eventual co-operation of my right hon. Friend, for I would remind the House of a certain highly nutritive Irish product, which possesses highly digestive properties, and if his digestion were aided by a good draught of Parnellite or anti-Parnellite juice, even red-hot protection would find its way down the throat of the right hon. Gentleman with the rapidity of greased lightning. I would point out to the House that what I ask it to endorse is a Resolution which would afford an opportunity for freeing this country from foreign dictation in connection with our commercial system. I ask the House to support our self-governing colonies in this matter. Experience has shown us that our commercial system as it has existed for the last fifty years has failed to obtain favour among Foreign Powers. ("No, no!") I say as it has existed in this country it has failed to obtain favour elsewhere. At



any rate, we stand alone in our advocacy of the principle, and I ask whether we are to remain alone in our isolation? [An hon. MEMBER: We are.] Someone says we are; but I would remind him that if we do, our Colonies will make their own commercial arrangements with Foreign Powers according to what they find best for themselves, and the Mother Country will be left out in the cold. That is not what I should like to see brought about; I should be sorry to see such a state of affairs, and therefore I desire to relieve myself from complicity in any such policy. The people of this country now realise that the circumstances under which our trade is carried on are widely different now from what they were half a century ago. Meetings on the subject have been held in various parts of the world. My hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Colonel Howard Vincent) will be able to tell the House of his own personal experience how this subject was taken up on the other side of the Atlantic. Meetings have also been held in this country, at some of which I have been present, where resolutions have been adopted in favour of a re-consideration of this question. Popular opinion, my belief is, will always support Parliament and the Government in obtaining fair advantages for British trade. I do not ask the House to adopt any course which would render dear the necessities of life to this country. [*Cheers and a cry of "Oh!"*] An hon. Gentleman says "Oh!" but he appears not to have followed me when I pointed out that the vast area of the British Empire, and the variety of its soil and climates, would enable to be grown every article required for the population of this country, either for the purposes of food or the supply of raw material for our manufactures. The principle which has been recommended is not to put prohibitive duties on food from Foreign States. What is suggested is that we should allow each component element of the British Empire to retain absolutely its own fiscal freedom, that every self-governing Colony should be entitled to place whatever duties it thinks fit upon all goods coming into its territorial limits, subject only to the condition that a preference should be given, it

may be slight, in favour of goods from other parts of the British Empire. That, I think, is a policy which cannot be open to the charge of ultra or excessive protection. The United Empire Trade League, which has been formed to carry out these principles, and which has among its members some of the most eminent statesmen among Her Majesty's colonial subjects, has that object in view. We do not desire in any shape or form to interpose barriers upon our foreign trade, because it is perfectly open to us, if we think fit, to admit all imports from our Colonies free, provided always that we give a slight preference to them over goods which come from abroad. Sir, I think that is a very moderate proposal to bring under the notice of the Government. I, of course, am perfectly aware, as Lord Salisbury pointed out to the deputation that waited upon him at the Foreign Office, that treaties entered into cannot be abrogated at a moment's notice; but the whole of Europe at the present moment affords the spectacle of every nation readjusting its tariffs, and as the Member for Bradford has just now very properly pointed out, the change is certainly in the direction of largely increasing their protective tariffs, and thereby injuriously affecting the trade of this country. That, therefore, affords an occasion for us to point out that the British Empire, alone amongst the States, has been unwise enough to barter away its own fiscal freedom, within the limits of its own Empire. I might be told—but I do not think I shall be told by any Member in this House, because the argument would be too foolish—For goodness sake do not irritate these Foreign Powers who are so anxious to afford every facility for British trade. Why, they have put up every obstacle in order to shut out British trade from their markets. But supposing there were any country which could say that it had in no way injured British trade by its tariffs, I would say, we only ask for the British Empire that same liberty to regulate its own internal affairs in this respect which every other country possesses. Does Germany, France, or any other country ask Foreign Powers what arrangements they may make with respect to their own internal affairs? It is a

Mr. James Lowther

universal principle that within the limits of its own dominions every Sovereign State is supreme. I do not wish to put the House to the trouble of a division, because this is a matter affecting our foreign relations, regarding which I think that everyone would be most desirous that it should not be a subject of controversy among us. But I am sure that Her Majesty's Government will share the aspirations of the Dominion of Canada; that they will be in harmony with the sentiments expressed by every self-governing community of the British Empire; that they have not receded from, but will rather have advanced upon, the expression of opinion upon this subject which I have quoted from the Prime Minister, and that they will give us an assurance that those "unlucky pledges," those "unfortunate treaties" as the Prime Minister termed them, will not continue to cause an embarrassment to the public service. I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given notice.

\*COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): In seconding the Motion of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Lowther), I wish to trespass on the indulgence of the House only for a few minutes. My right hon. Friend has gone so fully into the subject that very few words from me are necessary. But as the matter has, hitherto, been very little understood, I may be allowed to quote the clause of the Treaty referred to—I mean the 7th clause of the Treaty with Belgium, repeated in the Treaty with Germany in 1885, which hampers the free development of trade within the British Empire. It runs thus—

"Articles, the produce or manufacture of Belgium, shall not be subject to other or higher duties than those which are or may be imposed upon similar articles of British origin."

A Return was presented to Parliament in 1888 on my Motion, which contained this note by the Foreign Office:—

"While these two Treaties remain in force the express stipulations above quoted are extended to all countries whose Commercial Treaties with Great Britain contain a most favoured nation clause, and apply to British Colonies."

The effect of these Treaties was illustrated to the Senate and House of Commons of Canada the other day, when Mr. Abbott, the Prime Minister,

moved the Address to the Crown. He said that within the last three or four years they fixed a duty on goods imported from England at their value in England, while goods imported from Germany had to bear the increased cost of freight; that Germany remonstrated, and the Colony had to alter their law and put England and Germany in respect of such goods on the same footing. There is a case in which the Canadian Government, anxious to give British goods an advantage in Canada, were prohibited from doing so by these Treaties, which declare that foreign countries are to get equal advantages with British goods, whether the Colonies wish them to get those advantages or not. We can hardly wonder that the Prime Minister spoke of these Treaties as unlucky and unfortunate Treaties, and that he said we should take every opportunity that offered to deliver ourselves from such engagements. That was on the 19th June last; and we were hoping, Mr. Speaker, that we should hear some declaration either from the Leader of the House or from the President of the Board of Trade, to the effect that some means had been found in these seven or eight months to get rid of these very unfortunate engagements. My right hon. Friend has made reference to a representation made in this direction by the Agents-General of self-governing Colonies. The Member for the Brightside Division (Mr. Mundella) is in his place; and in his connection with the Trade and Treaties Committee he will recollect a deputation which came to him from the Agents-General of the self-governing Colonies urging the same thing—that the Empire should be freed from those Treaties. He will also recollect the deputation that waited upon him in which many hon. Gentlemen opposite as well as on this side took part, to urge that the Trade and Treaties Committee should recommend to Her Majesty's Government some means of freeing the United Kingdom, the Empire and Colonies from the engagements which tied our hands and prevented the development of inter-British trade. I do not know the feeling of the Member for the Brightside Division himself upon the subject. It may be that he is in favour of these restricting provisions, but we are en-

titled to know the view of the Committee as a whole. Several Reports of the Trade and Treaties Committee have been published, but not that No. 2 Report referring to this matter; and therefore we have no knowledge of what the recommendations of the Committee are upon this subject. I do submit to the President of the Board of Trade that we are entitled, on a matter in which great interest is taken by a large proportion of the industrial community here and in the Colonies, to know what is the definite opinion of that Committee as a whole? My right hon. Friend has referred to the expression of feeling in Canada, and he has mentioned the fact that I had had an opportunity of addressing public meetings there on this question. That is so, Mr. Speaker; and I can only say this: that addressing large gatherings called by the Chambers of Commerce or Boards of Trade as they are called in Canada and Newfoundland, I found only one feeling, and that was that the Empire should be free to make such commercial arrangements between the different portions of the Empire as seem fit to the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies. Only this evening I received by post a resolution from the Liberal Conservatives at North Grey, on Lake Superior, declaring that their Association expressed the earnest expectation that Her Majesty's Government would see their way clear to make some declaration of their intention to make favourable Customs arrangements between the United Kingdom and the colonies. It will be in the recollection of the House that this time last Session the Chancellor of the Exchequer entered his protest against the extreme application of the view that under no circumstances could we make fiscal arrangements with the colonies without injury to other portions of our trade. But he asked—

"What chance or hope have the colonies held out to us that they are prepared to move in this direction?"

I went to Canada to obtain an answer to the question of the right hon. Gentleman, and I have had the honour of transmitting to him these resolutions from public meetings in Canada. But, in addition, he has had a copy of

the Address from the Senate and the House of Commons of the Dominion and the representations of the Agent-General. Only a fortnight ago a meeting was held in Toronto which declared that Canada would be found ready to take her share in Imperial responsibilities if mutual trade were established. These, I submit, are satisfactory answers to the question raised last Session by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it only remains for us, I believe, to free the Empire from those Treaties which tie our hands at the present time, in order to be able to enter into commercial arrangements with our Colonies, or some of them, analogous to those between Germany and France and their Colonies, and now between Germany, Austria, and Italy. What do the Government propose to do in face of the statistics of trade lately issued by the Board of Trade? The Returns for the last year show a fall in the exports of British and Irish products by sixteen and a quarter millions sterling; and the Return for last month shows that the decline is continuing. The adverse result is felt not only in the constituency which I represent, but in Bradford, in the West Riding, and in many parts of Lancashire. I ask the Government what they propose to do in view of the injurious effect of the Reciprocity Treaties which have been concluded under Clause 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act in favour of American goods over British in Brazil, in Spain, and in other countries and markets where formerly the conditions were advantageous to British trade? I submit that Her Majesty's Government could not do better than show that they are determined to use the illimitable resources, the unequalled resources, of that vast Empire of which this is the centre and the headstone, and at any rate free themselves and the Colonies from Treaties which tie their hands. The Member for the Brightside Division will probably say, "Oh, but you cannot get rid of these Treaties, because some of their clauses are advantageous to British trade." But is there any reason, Mr. Speaker, why, if there be useful provisions in these two Treaties, we cannot give notice to terminate the Treaties in a year's time, and simultaneously enter into negotiations

*Colonel Howard Vincent*

to re-conclude them without the objectionable clauses? It is not Protection. All that we ask the Government or this House to do is, at any rate, to free our hands and enable us to have free and full development of trade within our Empire. I apologise for having trespassed so long upon the time of the House, and I beg now to second the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words, "But while glad to learn that Your Majesty's relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly, this House deplores the retention in certain Treaties with Foreign States of provisions which operate in restraint of the establishment of preferential trading relations amongst the several portions of Your Majesty's Empire, and humbly urges the early termination of such provisions in accordance with the prayer contained in the Addresses to Your Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, supported by the Representatives in this Country of the other self-governing Colonies."

—(Mr. James Lovther.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I hope my right hon. Friend will pardon me for not dealing with that part of his speech which related to the general subject of Protection and Free Trade. I do not agree with the views he expressed. I do not believe the people of this country agree with him, but I do not think this is the time to discuss the question, which after all is not directly raised by the Motion which is before the House. Sir, my right hon. Friend asks us, in the terms of that Motion, to terminate certain provisions in our Treaties with Belgium and the Zollverein in accordance with an Address passed by the two Houses of the Dominion Parliament. I think that we should view with the greatest possible respect any Resolutions passed by the Dominion Parliament. We should give them our very best attention; but we should do so with the recollection and the belief that we are better able to judge of the commercial relations of this country than even the Dominion Parliament. Sir, the Treaty of 1862 with Belgium, and the Treaty of 1865 with the Zollverein, do not prevent, as I think my right hon. Friend is aware, the

establishment of any kind of trade relations between our different colonies. All they do prevent is the establishment of, so to speak, preferential relations between the United Kingdom and one of her Colonies, and between one of the Colonies and the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, I am quite willing to admit that these provisions are a relic of a past generation. We should not dream of entering again into Commercial Treaties affecting our self-governing Colonies without the consent of those Colonies, and the Colonies are well aware of that fact. And I go further, and say that I do not think it advisable that we should be bound by any Treaty which would prevent us establishing any trade relations we might desire between the Colonies and ourselves. But when we are asked promptly and at the present moment to free ourselves from these engagements, we are met with considerations which I think can hardly have presented themselves sufficiently to my right hon. Friend. In the first place, this question was considered ten years ago, when both the Belgian and the German Governments were sounded as to their willingness to omit from those Treaties these particular provisions, while retaining the rest of the Treaties. Well, Sir, both of them absolutely declined to consider the question from that point of view. They said, naturally enough, that if you want to revise these Treaties you must revise them as a whole; and the House must look upon this question from the point of view of the whole of the Treaties—whether they are to be maintained or to be denounced. Now, what are we offered by my right hon. Friend in return for renouncing those Treaties? We are offered what he calls a comprehensive commercial policy—but what I should call a preferential arrangement of a very remarkable character between the Colonies and the United Kingdom. I confess that, speaking for myself, I would go a long way if I could secure a Zollverein between the colonies and the United Kingdom—a common tariff applicable to them all. But this proposal would injure us on the one side, without doing us any good on the other. Why would it injure us? The colonies, according to my right

hon. Friend, desire a preference in our markets for the produce which they principally send here. What is that produce? As the Prime Minister told us, it is corn, meat, wool—raw material and food, the cheapness of which is essential to the manufacturing and commercial interests of this country. Well then, supposing a duty imposed, as my right hon. Friend proposes, upon these things coming from foreign countries, leaving those coming from the colonies untaxed, what is the effect? Why the price would be raised by the amount of the duty, and perhaps more. If not raised, what good would it be to the colonies? We should, in fact, be adopting a policy of protection upon imported food for the benefit, not of our own agricultural interests, for whom we might all be anxious to do something, but for the benefit of the agricultural interests of our colonies. We should lose in that way. How should we gain? Would the colonies reduce their tariffs on our manufactured goods?

MR. J. LOWTHER: They would give us a preference.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: But what good would that do? You would leave them perfect freedom to impose as high duties as they choose upon manufactured goods from this country in competition with their own manufactures, giving a small, perhaps a 10 per cent., preference on our manufactures over manufactures coming from foreign countries. But what would be the good of that? The Colonies would take very good care to protect their own manufactures; and as regards the competition in the Colonial markets between ourselves and foreign countries, we have got these markets already on equal terms, and so on that side my right hon. Friend's scheme would do us no good at all. That is what—and I hope I have not unfairly described it—my right hon. Friend offers us in return for denouncing the Commercial Treaties of 1862 and 1865. But on what authority does my right hon. Friend make this offer? On no authority whatever. The House will not find in those resolutions of the Dominion Parliament any definite scheme proposed for the acceptance of Her Majesty's Government. The speeches of my right hon. Friend and of my hon. Friend the Member for

Sheffield were only based upon vague resolutions of public meetings, overflowing with sentiments in which we cordially share, of affection between the United Kingdom and the Colonies; but not adopting any definite policy at all. But now, what should we lose by denouncing those Treaties? Let me just state to the House what these Treaties give us. The Treaty with Belgium secures to British subjects the same treatment as natives with respect to all rights and privileges in matters of commerce and navigation, of payment of duties on tonnage, light-houses, quarantine, loading and unloading of vessels; permission to import and export goods in British vessels as in Belgian vessels; participation in coasting trade; protection of trade marks; payment of salvage dues on wrecked property; the right to enjoy most favoured nation treatment in all that relates to commerce and navigation; warehousing and transit of goods; and so on. The Treaty with the Zollverein confers on our subjects most favoured nation treatment in our commerce and trade, and contains stipulations respecting payment of taxes, import and export duties, reduction of carriage; prohibitions of import and export duties; and provisions for the free transport of goods and coal. These are very important provisions, as every one who knows the trade relations between the United Kingdom and those countries must be aware. Is this the time to risk the loss of them? My hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield has told us that a wave of protection is passing over Europe and other countries, and he suggested that we should join in the foolish policy. Well, I should not be surprised if before very long a neighbouring country felt very sorry for the length to which it has gone in this direction. But what has actually happened? These very treaties which my hon. Friends desire to denounce are at the present moment of the greatest service to us in contending with this policy. The House is aware that certain Commercial Treaties have recently been concluded between Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Belgium and Switzerland. I do not say they are free trade treaties, but in some important particulars they are

*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*

a step in that direction: and we have obtained the advantage of them for this country through those most favoured nation clauses in our treaties with Germany and Belgium. I have not yet got particulars of the new German tariff; but with regard to Belgium, in addition to transit facilities and other advantages we have obtained free entry into Belgium for no less than 13 different classes of goods, and a reduction in existing duties on 20 other kinds of articles. Now, I think I have said enough to show the House that the proposal of my right hon. Friend would be injurious to this country. I do not think that such engagements would be entered into at the present time; and I agree that when a favourable opportunity occurs it would be well to attempt to obtain a revision of the provisions to which he objects, but this is not the time to move, and Her Majesty's Government cannot undertake to move in the direction in which they are asked to go by my right hon. Friend.

MR. C. W. GRAY (Essex, Maldon): I must apologise for venturing to interpose during the course of this discussion, but I should just like to say that I think that there would be a benefit accruing to the British farmer if a plan of this sort were adopted. We want industrial activity in all parts of the country and among all our trades, because we know that when the manufacturing districts are doing well, when the wheels and the machinery in the cotton spinning districts are going round, the operatives in these trades under these circumstances are the very best customers of our agricultural districts. We want to see the industries of England going on at high pressure. My hon. Friend the Member for West Newington (Mr. C. W. Radcliffe-Cooke), who is a most ardent Free Trader, will scarcely dispute the statement that if our trade amongst ourselves were maintained it would be better for this great Empire than if that trade were going on in Germany, or in France. We know that almost all our English operatives, with perhaps the exception of a few that came up to London and posed as agricultural labourers, although probably they have never in their lives taken an agricultural labourers' wages on a Saturday night, believe in as much work as

possible being done here at home, and as many sovereigns and shillings as possible being paid on Saturday night to the operatives here at home. As to the agricultural part of the question, I believe if you canvassed all the British farmers between the Lands End and John O'Groats, you would find that if our throats are to be cut they would prefer that the operation should be performed by our own kith and kin. We know from the position of our labourers that they are not in a position to pay high prices for the necessities of life, nor do we desire that they should do so. We want fair play between the Mother Country and the Colonies, and when all the industries of the old country are active, we learn that we shall profit by that activity, because there will be an increased demand for a great deal of the agricultural produce which can be, and which ought to be, raised on our home fields.

(11.12.) MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford): Sir, I desire, on behalf of myself and on behalf of those sitting on this side of the House, to express our thanks to the President of the Board of Trade for the way he has answered the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who introduced this Amendment. Anything more sound, more candid, or more complete as an answer it would be impossible to look for. There is no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman who introduced this Amendment looks to Protection, and there is no prospect of any scheme of the kind he mentioned being successful, even from the right hon. Gentleman's own standpoint, without Protection. Reference has been made to a meeting in Bradford, and I must say that I do not think there is any man in Lancashire or Yorkshire who has thoroughly ascertained the conditions of those so-called protected industries who would wish really to transplant his industry or his prospects from one country to another. I could have wished that the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman had run upon lines such as these—that seeing the evils produced by the war system in Europe, the social and industrial condition of every nation affected by it, it would have been well if this Government could have been induced to bring about a reduction of the armaments of Europe, and thus to institute a much better condition of

things. What can be ascertained beyond doubt is this: that the increased tariffs of every country in Europe and of the United States are directly traceable to the wars of 1863, 1864, and the war of 1870. What confidence can hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen have in what they call Moderate Protection. Where is the country that is practising it? Everywhere it is being abandoned. Does not that clearly show that, like moderate drinking, there must be a continual increase of the dose? If that is not the case, how is it that no country in Europe and that neither Canada nor the United States has been content with moderate protection? Hon. Gentlemen opposite talk of a moderate increase of five shillings per quarter on wheat, but that five shillings would be swallowed up by the landlord to begin with, and then they would want another five shillings for the farmer, and after that another ten shillings for the labourer. There is no limit. I do not hesitate to say that the hostile tariffs of every country in the world have operated to some extent injuriously to the trade of this country. But if hon. Gentlemen had been candid they would have said that the exports of every other country have been declining as well as our own—in some instances more so. There is nothing in the condition of Europe or America that should lead us to abandon our present position. We are on solid ground. If it is one-sided Free Trade, it is all in favour of this country, and the burden falls on others. They have to pay an increased, even an extravagant, price for their commodities. If we can induce this Government, or any Government or country, to take up the question of these excessive and crushing armaments, which are the curse of the world, we should do something to improve our own industries and to better industrial relationships with and in every country in Europe.

(11.19.) Mr. BYRON REED (Bradford, E.): Sir, I should not be loyal to the constituency which I represent if I allowed the opinions of my hon. Colleague opposite to go forth as the opinions of the people of Bradford. The conclusion that I have deliberately arrived at, which is shared by

*Mr. Illingworth*

the great mass of the employed labour, is that unless something very speedily for the relief of our trial classes we shall be in a condition of partial depopulation. I can assure the House that I could wish a better electoral cry in my constituency than that of my hon. Colleague opposite than the cry of Fair Trade. I am with some surprise to the statement of my hon. Colleague, that the condition of the Bradford trade is better than that of the United States. I know the manufacturers who, owing to the fair competition of American goods, have taken their capital and moved to the United States, being unable to make a profit or to find employment for their own people at home. I am in fear of the cry of Protection raised against us. The great majority of the working classes are in theory all are in theory, Free Trade advocates of a system of free importation of raw material, but also in favour of such pressure being put on foreign Governments as will enable the products of the British artisan to have free access to the markets of the world.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: After taking courage I have met with no desire to embarrass the Government by taking a division, it being of opinion undesirable to do so in a question affecting treaties with foreign Powers. I therefore beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Question, "That the Amendment be withdrawn," put, and negatived.

Question, "That the proposed Amendment be there added," put, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned"—(Mr. Broadhurst.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is an unusual time to move the adjournment of the Debate on any day but the first day of the Session; but I believe it is customary on the first day that we adjourn at a somewhat earlier hour than usual, and, therefore, I have assented to the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

House adjourned at two minutes past Eleven

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday, 10th February, 1892.*

The House met at 12 o'clock.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to give notice that I shall move an Amendment to the Address in the following words:—We deem it our duty to acquaint your Majesty that a decisive majority of the Irish people and of their representatives in this House are convinced of the inability of this Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as the distinctive interests of that country require, and this conviction has been intensified by the manifest failure of the Land Purchase Act, 1891, to afford an acceptable basis for the extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland.

PETITION.

THE REPRESENTATION OF EAST BELFAST.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I have to present a Petition from the inhabitants of East Belfast, calling the attention of the House to the practical disfranchisement of that constituency, and in view of legislation affecting Ireland during the present Session, asking this House to declare the seat vacant. As the Petition affects a Member of this House I beg to request that the Prayer of the Petitioner be read by the Clerk at the Table.

Petition presented, and read by the Clerk.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I have to present a Petition from the Orange Lodges of Belfast with a prayer to the same effect.

NEW WRIT.

For the Borough of Liverpool, Everton Division, *v.* Edward Whitley, Esq., deceased.—(*Mr. Akers Douglas.*)

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.

On the Motion of the President of the Board of Trade (Sir Michael Hicks Beach) leave was given to introduce the following Bills:—

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 1) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the North Eastern Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 2) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Company and certain other Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 3) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 4) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the Abbotsbury Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 5) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the North Staffordshire Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER CONFIRMATION (NO. 6) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Company and certain other Companies.

G



RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER  
CONFIRMATION (NO. 7) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the Midland and South Western Junction Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES ORDER  
CONFIRMATION (NO. 8) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, of the Taff Vale Railway Company and certain other Railway Companies.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER  
MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [9th February]—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

We take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the afflicting dispensation of Providence with which Your Majesty and this Nation have been visited, in the death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale:

We assure Your Majesty of our heartfelt participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Your Majesty's family under this grievous affliction, and in the deep sense entertained by all classes of Your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which the Country has sustained by the loss of a Prince who had won for himself the general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."—(*Mr. Hermon Hodge.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

\*(12.25.) MR. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.): I think it is to be regretted that no Member of Her Majesty's Government—that is to say, no member of the Cabinet—is present at the commencement of business to hear what hon. Members have to say in regard to the affairs of the country, and prepared to give explanations that may be asked for. The President of the Board of Trade is entering as I speak, but still I maintain it should be the duty of the Leader of the House to be present on an occasion of this kind. My object, in the first place, is to draw attention to the remote position occupied by the Employers' Liability Bill in the programme of the business of the Session. This, I think, is a just cause of complaint, and we are amply justified in calling attention to it. For five or six years past the Government have dangled this subject before the eyes of our workpeople without making any adequate effort to deal with it. I am perfectly aware that the Government did, in the Session of 1888, introduce a Bill and, by a sort of sledge-hammer process, and against the protests of all those concerned on behalf of workmen, brought that measure to a certain stage of procedure in this House. They succeeded in carrying that stage by a considerable majority, but they proceeded no further with it, and since then the only indication shown by the Government that they really have any interest in the question has been by continually finding some corner in the Queen's Speech in which to mention it, but making no further attempt to proceed with legislation upon this important matter. Now the Government have had ample time, plenty of opportunity, with a willing—I might almost say a clannish—majority at their back; and there is no excuse for thus neglecting the interests of the workmen. Had the Government been in earnest with regard to this question, they would have found the House—on this side, at any rate—quite prepared to co-operate with them in passing a good, substantial Bill. But they have not made any such attempt; they have shown no indication of being earnest in this matter. Here we are at what is presumably the last Session of this

Parliament—almost at the death-bed of the Government of the day—I mean the political death-bed of the Government. The President of the Board of Trade does not seem to believe it, but I imagine he is about the only man in the country who does not. I say we have indications from all parts of the country, the evidence we had here yesterday seems to indicate that the country, at any rate, is of that opinion, whether the right hon. Gentleman is or not. In my opinion we are undoubtedly near the last hours of the present Government, and they have on this occasion again mentioned this subject almost at the end of Her Majesty's most gracious Speech, without any evidence that they are in earnest in regard to it. Indeed, the Leader of the House, in his reply last night, made no mention of the subject at all, treating the whole affair with the utmost contempt and disdain, passing by the Home Secretary's Bill without any reference. Indeed, as Leader of the House, he dealt with some other measures in an original manner. He practically abandoned the idea of introducing the District Councils Bill, and yet that Bill occupies on the programme a superior position to the Employers' Liability Bill. Well, if the Government have made up their minds not to make any attempt to deal with District Councils, then it is apparently certain, so far as one can draw a conclusion, that to mention the question of Employers' Liability is a mere farce, and that the Government have no intention to make any attempt, direct or otherwise, to deal with the subject. Now, Her Majesty's Government know perfectly well that when in 1888 they occupied a considerable portion of the time of the House, both here and in Grand Committee upstairs, with their Bill, that we were all anxious—as anxious as the right hon. Gentleman was—to dispose of this question once for all; and if Her Majesty's Government had on that occasion shown the least inclination to meet the reasonable demands of the people, by pushing the Bill on the lines of justice, the Bill would have been passed. But the right hon. Gentleman introduced a measure which was not acceptable to the people, which

was objected to by all workmens' organizations, and which was condemned by a very large minority of Members of this House. He, standing to his guns, so to speak, refused to make the least concession, and by his dogged resistance the Bill was destroyed. Now, if the Home Secretary should be permitted by the Leader of the House to proceed with the Bill this Session, and if it is a Bill conceived in the same narrow, suspicious spirit as was the Bill of 1888, then the same tactics will be adopted by those opposed to it in 1892 as were pursued in 1888. But meantime the Government have learned from experience, if they have progressed in the path of Tory democratic policy on this as they have on other subjects that they propose dealing with this Session, and I should think the Home Secretary will have kept pace with his colleagues, and will be prepared, after four years' study, to introduce a Bill having for its main principles simplicity, straightforwardness, and ample justice to the working people, for whom this measure is chiefly needed. I make a very frank offer of assistance, and equally frank is the confession of a determination to oppose the measure, unless it be a reasonably good and fair one. I hope the Government will on their part be frank in any reply they may make to-day, and will tell us whether they really intend to make any attempt with the Bill or not. If they have no such intention, if the Bill is only mentioned in the Speech to extend the programme and make a demonstration at the commencement of the Session, then let us be told that at once, just as the Leader of the House told us in regard to the District Councils Bill, that there is no hope of passing it; that it is only put into the programme for filling up purposes; that they are not the least in earnest about this or any other of the Radical measures they profess their desire to pass into law. I am not going to dwell at greater length on the subject than to say that our demands with regard to employers' liability are simply based on common justice, having regard to the existing law. All we ask is this: that the workpeople of the country shall have the same law applied to

them as is applied to other subjects of Her Majesty; that we shall be under no disqualification arising out of legally spun theories of common employment, upon which the Home Secretary loves to dwell, but which most other legal authorities have long abandoned as untenable. If the right hon. Gentleman will abandon his old-fashioned notions and place himself in line with the march of the opinions of the day, then we say we will welcome him, we will help him to pass his Bill, and he may go back to his constituents and appeal to them for a renewal of their confidence with at least one measure of importance down to his credit, and having during long years of office made an effort to pass legislation in the interest of workmen, their wives and children. There is one other subject I must ask the right hon. Gentleman's attention to before I sit down. Last Session he passed an Act amending the Factory and Workshops Consolidation Act of 1878, and by that Act, if I remember rightly, he abolished certifying surgeons—"No, no!"—well they were not abolished, but the attempt was made to abolish certifying surgeons. At any rate, the effect of the Act of last Session, if it has been effective at all, if it will have any effect beyond that part of it which the Opposition secured, namely, the raising of the age of half-timers—and that, of course, will be effective—but if the other portions of the Act, which the right hon. Gentleman is responsible for, have any effect, there will necessarily be a large increase in the duties of the Factory and Workshops Inspectors. Well but, previously to the passing of the Act causing these additional duties, everybody admitted that the staff of Inspectors was totally inadequate to cope with the work imposed upon them. The Home Secretary, either at the commencement of last Session or the previous Session, undertook in this House, in answer to questions, to consider the question of an increase of the staff, and on one occasion, if I remember rightly, he almost promised that there should be an increase in the number of Inspectors. If the Act of last Session is to be enforced, new duties will be added to the work of the

overburdened Inspectors. I do not know what the right hon. Gentleman has done during the recess; but, at any rate, there has been no public intimation, so far as I have been able to gather from the ordinary channels of information, that the Government have made up their mind, or made any effort, to increase the staff of Inspectors. I know the right hon. Gentleman will get up and say, as he has said before, that he cannot fill the country with Inspectors, and that too many Inspectors will interfere with trade, and that people must assist the administration of the law themselves by making communications to the Inspectors when the law is evaded. All that we have heard before many, many times, and it has been replied to again and again, that it is the duty of the Government, if they declare these laws are necessary, to see that the laws are enforced. It is not the duty of workmen and workwomen, whose bread might be taken from their mouths, and their children starved, and their prospects ruined, to become the unpaid and unauthorised Inspectors of the Home Office. What we want is a reasonable increase. We are not asking that the Government should double the number or flood the country with Government Inspectors. All we ask is a reasonable increase to such a number as will make it reasonably probable that the law declared by both Houses of Parliament to be necessary shall not become a dead letter. Is the right hon. Gentleman, and are his colleagues, prepared to meet the demands of the friends of the workpeople and all who are concerned in this matter, or not? Let us have an answer, "yes" or "no," once for all, and then we shall know how to act, and what proceedings to take to bring our views of the necessity of the case before the Government. I have no intention of occupying the time of the House on this subject; but there is one other matter to which I ask permission to refer while I am upon these labour subjects, but this does not relate to the right hon. Gentleman's Department, but to the Board of Works. During last Session of Parliament a Resolution was agreed to in this House, at the request, I believe, of the First Commissioner of Works, that in future

*Mr. Broadhurst*

fair wages should be paid to the men engaged upon Government contracts. While in some cases that pledge has been redeemed, in others it has not. I should have liked—but I only had a communication to day from a trade concerned, namely, the London painters and decorators—to have given the First Commissioner notice of my intention to mention this. I wish he were present to tell the House why it is that the Resolution we agreed to, a modified Resolution, a compromise made at his own suggestion and adopted by the House without opposition, why that Resolution has not been faithfully interpreted, not been put in practice with all the trades concerned in Government contracts? I understand the complaint arises chiefly from the London painters and decorators. According to a circular I have received, the painters in meeting assembled—I have not a copy of the circular with me—have passed a resolution requesting Members of this House to call the attention of the Government to this subject—that the Department still refuses to pay the same rate of wages as has been paid by Messrs. Holland and Hannen for years back to their painters and decorators. If I remember aright, the circular intimates that the Government pay a halfpenny an hour less than the recognised rate of wages in the trade as paid by the best reputed firms in the Metropolis. I have no doubt the First Commissioner will take an early opportunity of inquiring into this matter. I am glad to see he has just entered the House. I was complaining of the want of good faith, so far as information has reached me a few hours ago, on the part of the Government in not giving effect to the Resolution of last Session, that all trades employed in the Department of Public Works should be paid at the current rate of wages paid by firms in the trade. In one case, that of the painters, the Government still refuse to pay the wages as paid by Messrs. Holland and Hannen, one of the oldest and most respected firms in the country; the Government are still paying something like a halfpenny an hour less than the prevailing rate of wages. The trade concerned through its members in meeting have asked Members of

the House to inquire why the Government have not carried out in good faith the Resolution which was, if I remember rightly, heartily accepted by the First Commissioner, and, indeed, was a Resolution originally moved on this side of the House and amended by the right hon. Gentleman, he, as I understand, giving his word that the terms of the Resolution should be faithfully observed. We want to know if the statement I make on the authority of a printed circular is true, and why, if it is true, the Resolution has not been observed in the case of the painters, while it has been observed fairly, honourably, and straightforwardly by the right hon. Gentleman with regard to other trades? I am very pleased to see that the Leader of the House is now present, though I regret he was not present at the commencement of my remarks, for I should like to have from him some assurance on the subject as to which I complained. Will he tell us, in the most straightforward way he can, whether the Government intend to proceed with the Employers' Liability Bill? I do not wish in any way to complain that the Government have placed a scheme for Local Government for Ireland at the head of their programme; on the contrary I am glad they have done so; because, if the measure passes, it will be an initial stage to complete Home Rule established by the House of Commons, and it will save considerable labour to this side of the House in time to come when we are engaged upon a measure for completing the liberties of the Irish people. Neither do I complain of the measure in the charge of the Minister for Agriculture; but, on the contrary, I am pleased to see the progress made by a member of Her Majesty's Government on the subject to which, at no very distant date, he was bitterly opposed. It will be an additional interest to see this measure for the creation of small holdings passed through the House of Commons by the Minister for Agriculture, who used to be the champion in heaping ridicule and contempt upon those who suggested such legislation eight or ten years back. Of these two measures I make no complaint; but, at any rate, the question of employers' liability

should have been considered next in importance, if not of equal importance, with these two, if the Government really wish to do justice to the work-people by doing their utmost to protect the lives and limbs of the heads of families among the labouring community. I thank the House for allowing me to make this appeal, and not only an appeal, for again I offer support and hearty co-operation. I will stay here as late and as long as any member of the Government is prepared to stay if the Home Secretary will only introduce such a Bill as commends itself to the reasonable judgment of my fellow-workmen through the United Kingdom.

\*(12.53.) THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. D. R. PLUNKET, Dublin University): As the hon. Member has informed the House, he has given me no notice of his intention to raise the subject with which my Department is concerned.

MR. BROADHURST: I did not get the communication in time to do so, and this was my only chance.

MR. D. R. PLUNKET: I had no idea that the hon. Member intended to go into the subject to which he has referred, so far as it affects the Department over which I have the honour to preside, else, of course, I would have been in my place to listen more fully to his remarks than I have been able to do. However, he has been good enough to repeat his earlier observations, so that I assume I now know the whole of what he had to say touching my Office. I have not the papers with me, but I think that without reference to the papers I shall be able to give an answer which will be satisfactory to the House. In the first place, I am very glad that the hon. Member, speaking, as he is well entitled to speak, on behalf of the interests of the working men concerned in this question, has nothing to complain of as to the carrying out by the Government of the Resolution of the House of Commons passed last year, except on the special point to which he has referred. I have also to thank him for his kind acknowledgment of the endeavour, at all events, which has been made, so far as we could make it

to give general effect to that Resolution, and to carry it out in good faith. I am glad to have his assent so far. But what I must take objection to is this. He says that in the particular matter of the painters we employ under contracts which are given out by the Board of Works we have not given effect to that Resolution. I do not think he fully intended to make the accusation of bad faith; at all events, it is not likely that, having fully endeavoured to carry out in every other respect the Resolution of last year, we should deliberately have been guilty of bad faith, even if we had made a mistake in this matter of the painters. But I will explain how the case stands. In the original agreement entered into with Messrs. Holland and Hannen, a contract with which the House is well acquainted, for maintenance and repairs, there was at first a slight mistake in the figures they gave us as regards painters, and subsequently there was some correspondence between the representatives of the painters, or some of them, in the Metropolis and my office. The demand of the painters was that they should be paid at the *minimum* rate of 8d. or 8½d. an hour, some giving the one figure, some the other. The House will remember it was not proposed in the Resolution, and it certainly was disclaimed by those who supported it on behalf of the workmen last year, that the intention of the Resolution was to stereotype in every case as the rate of wages current in the market the rates which Trades Unions might desire. All we undertook to do was to ascertain what was actually agreed upon between the employers and the workmen in each trade, and, so far as we could, to see that that rate of payment was adopted. I am very glad to know that in all other trades, many of them much larger than the painters, with whom we have to deal, we have been able to give effect to the Resolution of the House of Commons by finding out and adopting these rates which are agreed upon in the trades. But as regards the painters, it was much more difficult to ascertain exactly what their rate of wages was. We at first were under the impression that it was a lower rate than was afterwards

*Mr. Broadhurst*

adopted. After a very full and complete investigation, we came to the conclusion as to what was a fair estimate of what was generally paid. Of course, as the hon. Gentleman knows, in many instances much less is paid; but what may be taken as a fair estimate of the usual *minimum* rate is 8d., and that is the scale we have adopted. Now, I hope the House will agree that when the demand made by the men themselves varied as between 8d. and 8½d., and we gave 8d., we have not, at all events, failed in good faith, or in recognising the Resolution of the House of Commons, and will think that this complaint is not well founded.

(12.59.) MR. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I may be allowed a few words on this subject, as I had the honour of introducing the Resolution which has been referred to. I could wish there had been the opportunity for giving notice of the intention to mention this matter, for I have had some correspondence in regard to it, and it would be well if we were in a position to deal with documents as well as recollection. I feel sure that no one in the House, and certainly not my hon. Friend below me, would wish to bring an accusation of bad faith against the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner, or his Department, in reference to the question of Government contracts; but I am bound to say that, so far as I can judge, the Resolution, adopted by the House of Commons unanimously last Session in reference to Government contracts, has not been satisfactorily carried out, so far, by any of the Departments. I personally have had a great deal of correspondence on these matters, and I believe that a great deal of good has been done by those whom my hon. Friend calls unpaid Inspectors—members of Trades Unions, and others—in calling attention to matters which have been placed before the Departments. I may say that in every correspondence I have had with different Departments—the Admiralty, the War Office, the Board of Works—complaints have been received with the utmost consideration and courtesy. I do not propose to touch on any of the questions with which the Admiralty or War Office are concerned. I think,

probably on some future occasion, in Committee of Supply or otherwise, we may have to raise this question in connection with other trades and other Departments; but, meantime, I confine myself to a few words in reference to this particular case. As my hon. Friend has said, there is no ground of complaint against the Department so ably presided over by my right hon. Friend in the matter of carrying out the Resolution passed last year, except in regard to this matter of the painters. In regard to other trades in which my hon. Friend is interested, I believe the First Commissioner has fairly carried out the letter and spirit of the Resolution; but unquestionably there has been considerable complaint as to the rate the Board of Works are paying, and propose to pay, to painters engaged in work for the Department. The right hon. Gentleman will remember that when the contract was originally made Messrs. Holland and Hannen put down the rate of pay for painters at 8½d. Well, Messrs. Holland and Hannen having paid that without complaint for a limited time, then came to the Board of Works and stated, that they had made an error in regard to the figure, and desired to amend it, substituting 7½d. Upon that the Board of Works made the alteration to 7½d. an hour, and so the matter rested for a few weeks. The men, of course, very soon came to find out this reduction had been made, and made representations through myself and others to the right hon. Gentleman. Then after considerable correspondence and several personal interviews, and a good deal of time occupied, and trouble taken, the Board of Works agreed to raise the rate from 7½d. to 8d., but declined altogether to raise it to 8½d. Now I am bound to say, that in the consideration of this demand of the painters there was a great difficulty. In other building trades there have been agreements drawn up between representatives of the masters and of the men, by which certain specific wages have been stated to be those recognised in the trade; and I think it is because there has been this agreement between masters and men in other trades that the Department of the right hon. Gentleman has found no trouble in coming to a proper con-

clusion. But in regard to the painters, an agreement was made in 1873 to which Messrs. Holland and Hannen were parties and signatories, and under that it was arranged that the rate of wages should be raised  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. an hour, which the next year was increased to 1d. But in that agreement it was not specifically stated that  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. was the minimum rate for wages, but it was generally understood in the trade. It was so, and on the part of the men it is contended that for private work, Messrs. Holland and Hannen, and other contractors, do pay at the rate of  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. It was only in regard to Government work that they reduced the rate from  $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and paid originally  $\frac{1}{4}$ d., and now pay 8d. I am not going to say what ought to be the real rate of painters' wages; but the accusation brought against the right hon. Gentleman in regard to this matter is this: that when the matter was decided he declined, in the exercise of his discretion, no doubt quite wisely, to meet the representatives of the men to discuss the matter, while he did so meet representatives of the employers interested, Messrs. Holland and Hannen; and it was after an interview with them, and I am not quite sure as to other employers, that the rate was fixed. What we ask in regard to the matter is, that before the rate is irrevocably fixed the right hon. Gentleman's Department should see representatives of the men, as well as representatives of the masters. I quite agree it is not the business of the Government to fix the particular rate of wages in a particular trade; but the form of the Resolution to which we unanimously agreed—and I am bound to say that I think the form of my original Resolution was better than that submitted by the right hon. Gentleman—but even the Resolution substituted by the right hon. Gentleman was, that after making provisions as to subletting, the Government should make every effort to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted in the trade as the current rate paid to competent workmen. We ask that, in the endeavour to arrive at a conclusion, the Department shall not proceed upon information derived from only one side, but should take the representations of parties on both sides. Unfortunately the question of painters'

*Mr. Buxton*

wages is very much more difficult to decide than the question of wages in other trades; but if it can be proved that Messrs. Holland and Hannen and others are paying to painters on private work  $\frac{1}{2}$ d., will the right hon. Gentleman be prepared to raise the minimum to  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for Government work? That is the question we ask. The right hon. Gentleman has met us with the utmost fairness and courtesy, and we desire only that the contracts from his Department and from other Departments shall be properly carried out, as was intended by the Resolution. The essence of that Resolution is, that the Government shall not in the amount they pay tend to depress the average rate of wages in a trade, that while not paying more neither shall they pay less than the current market rate. What the painters are afraid of is, that if this contract is allowed to continue without protest, the firms now paying  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for private work will contend that, inasmuch as 8d. is paid for Government work, the latter figure is established as a fair rate, and private work must be reduced to 8d. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will say he is prepared to re-consider this point, and that, in order to arrive at a fair conclusion in accordance with the Resolution of last Session, he will agree to consider the views of the men as well as of the employers.

\*(1.10.) MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): I think the question now before us is a very proper one to engage our attention in a debate upon the Address. I congratulate the House upon having, for the first time, a labour question introduced upon such an occasion. It is a new departure the House is taking in now discussing the subject of painters' wages. We generally, in these debates, deal with subjects of far less interest—matters of foreign policy, the balance of power, and such matters—which, of course, are of far less interest to the people we represent than the question of a halfpenny more or less in the rate of wages. The only remark I shall add to what the hon. Gentleman said, is merely also to urge upon the Home Secretary that he will see that this matter of wages is put right. It was not at all

with the object of speaking about the claims of wages, however interesting the subject is, that I rose this afternoon. I want to make a few criticisms upon certain phrases used in the speech of the Mover of the Address. The mere employment of the word "Unemployed," in a speech made in moving the Address, is one of the most remarkable things I have heard in this House during the five years I have sat in it. I think I have, in every debate on the Address, introduced this question of the unemployed; and as at last I have got some response from the Government on this question, I shall not despair some day of having something done. What I wish to say merely is to criticise the proposed remedy brought forward by the Mover of the Address. Speaking upon this question of the unemployed—those men by whom our commercial supremacy has been founded—it was proposed to help them by granting better facilities for agricultural labourers to acquire land in the country. That, I think, is the most inconclusive way of dealing with the unemployed that I have ever heard, even from a man who seems to speak in the name of the Government. I cannot see myself, how granting extra facilities to acquire land to agricultural labourers is going to touch the question of the unemployed in the very smallest degree. It always seemed to me to be one of the most quack remedies that could be advanced. I venture to say to any Government that is going to deal with the question that the question is not to be dealt with in that way. It would be a very easy thing indeed to deal with it, if it could be dealt with in that manner. But I maintain that it is not to be practically dealt with in that way at all. There is a tendency, I think, in this nineteenth century for people to congregate together in large towns. The superior inducements of town life, and the superior rate of wages, and the amusements held out to them tend, in the long run, to bring them together; and being there, it would be better for the Government to endeavour to deal with the unemployed in the towns themselves, rather than in the country in the very inconclusive way which was sketched out yesterday. I main-

tain that it would be far better for the Government to do something towards the limitation of the hours of labour than merely to refer to the question in this perfunctory manner, as was done yesterday. If you grant the land to the agricultural labourers it does not seem to me that anything that you could do at such a distance, to work upon a problem which is so very acute as this undoubtedly is, would be likely to have the least degree of success; and therefore, although I have heard with great pleasure this reference to the unemployed, I do not think that anything will practically come out of the means of dealing with the question proposed by the Government. If you really want to do anything in the country itself, in my opinion, it can only be done by the acquisition of the land by the State as a whole. The proposal to deal with the question, by giving further facilities for raising up a peasant proprietary, is, in my opinion, the very greatest system of quackery that was ever heard of. We have seen a peasant proprietary established in almost every part of the world—in Germany, in Flanders, in France—and wherever they have been raised they have fallen into the hands of the money-lenders and the gombeen men, and they have a much harder lot than our agricultural labourers. Passing from this subject, of course it is almost a duty for me, holding the opinions I do, to perform the task to which I now address myself. I have listened with every attention and great sympathy to the very eloquent speeches which have been delivered in this House with reference to the unfortunate death of the late Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and the death of Mr. Smith, the late leader of this House. In reference to the late Duke of Clarence, I deplore to see any young man so very suddenly snatched away in the prime of life, and with such prospects as that unfortunate young man had before him. I also deplore that such a tried statesman as Mr. Smith, who gave satisfaction to both sides of the House, and also enjoyed the unbounded respect of all of us, should be taken from us. But there was one man who used to sit upon these benches, whose death I personally deplore more than that of



either of the men I have mentioned—I refer to the late Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell. He was human, like the rest of us. He had his faults, as we all have; but when time has blotted out his faults, and when his qualities, which I consider great undoubtedly, have been more clearly discerned, when the present unhappy dissensions among the Irish Party have been removed, as they will be removed some day, the present generation will undoubtedly say that a most remarkable man, whom those in this House, if they did not all respect, very largely feared, has been taken from us; a man with whom I myself was acquainted on terms of friendship, and whose death, under the unfortunate circumstances which occurred, I shall always deplore, as having deprived this House of the most remarkable man who sat in it in this century.

\*(1.20.) SIR ALBERT KAYE ROLLIT (Islington, South): I agree with the hon. Member for Lanark that the present condition of the working classes is one of the most important questions that could be discussed in this House, and I regard it as a good augury that such matters should have been raised and discussed at this early period of the Session. These labour questions will demand consideration and solution, and, if the House is not familiarised with them, it may be called upon to legislate upon them in haste and without mature reflection, which would be a source of great injury, perhaps, to the country and to all classes. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Nottingham spoke of his proposal as a Radical measure; but I think it should not be forgotten, when dealing with this question, that the foundation of the discussion is the reference to it in the Speech from the Throne; and, secondly, that the minor grievances brought before the House, in regard to the painters, is based upon a Resolution which was passed by Her Majesty's Government last Session, in which very proper consideration is given to the rate of wages in all trades, and to the rate that ought to exist in relation to the Government contracts. But before I come to this point, I should like to say a word or two upon the Employers' Liability Act, a subject which

raises a good deal of debateable matter. A great deal has been said in favour of the retention of the Judge-made law as to the doctrine of Common Employment. It was first applied in the early part of this century, and I think it is now somewhat out of harmony with the general ideas which prevail at this time. And I venture, with some familiarity with the law, to say that it undoubtedly, in many instances, works considerable injustice. I do not suppose that, on a debate upon the Address, we are likely to come to any common conclusion on that subject. But what I venture to suggest to the Home Secretary is that, when he is preparing his measure on this question, and when he submits it to the House, he shall, at any rate take care, whatever he may do with reference to the abstract question of common employment, to deal with some of the real and practical grievances which at present affect the working classes in relation to their employment. Take first the question of notice required under the Employers' Liability Act. The Act requires that in order to sustain a claim there must have been served previous notice in writing, of six weeks, which must give certain particulars. After considerable experience in dealing with this question I am satisfied that this matter of notice urgently requires amendment. I do not speak generally of employers—far otherwise—but I do know employers who are eminently charitable during the six weeks after an accident, and when the six weeks have expired the charity disappears. The result is that a man finding himself being kindly dealt with allows the six weeks to expire, and the six weeks having expired he is without remedy at law, and benevolence is put an end to. Under the section, if the Judge is of opinion that no injustice would be worked by an amendment as regards the notice, then an amendment may be allowed to be made; but if the notice is not given, or if it is faulty in complying with certain requirements of the Act, then, no matter whether it be unjust or not, the notice is bad, or the want of it fatal, and the Court is not empowered to make an amendment. Now, I take one instance with which I have some personal acquaintance. Here an acci-

*Mr. Cunningham Graham*

dent happened. The person injured gave full particulars of it to the Inspector. The Inspector reported it to the superintendent of the works, and it ultimately came to the knowledge of the employer. And afterwards, and within the six weeks, a letter was written by the workman to the employer again stating that the accident had occurred, and referring him to the full particulars which had so been previously given. It is held in that case that there had been no adequate notice, and no amendment was allowed to be made; and notwithstanding the knowledge which the employer possessed, that man, in my opinion, was denied justice. It has been said that law and equity are two things which God has joined together, and which man has put asunder; and I think this is a notable instance of that description. If an amendment can be allowed to be made in point of form, and if the Court is satisfied, though no notice was technically given, yet that all the facts came under the notice of the employer, and that no injustice would be worked by it, I think that the principle applies, and that an amendment ought to be made. Speaking from memory, I believe that in case of the death, of a person no notice need be given, even by his relatives or personal representatives. In other words, an action can be sustained without any notice. Well, if in the case of death, which prevents notice being given by an individual himself, notice can be dispensed with, and no injustice is likely to be done, it can equally be dispensed with in the case of mere omission through want of memory, or the exercise of charity under such circumstances as I have stated, if, again, the Judge finds it will not cause injustice or surprise or fraud. That is a practical point on which some reform is necessary, and I hope that the Home Secretary will bear it in mind. There is another point which I think equally capable of amendment. The Act limits compensation to the recovery of not exceeding three years' wages. Well, I hardly know why that limitation should have been made. It is quite true that the action has to be commenced in a County Court, the

jurisdiction of which is, generally, of limited extent. But there is a right of removal of such action to a superior Court, and of course the question of the amount involved might properly be taken into account by the Judge, though, as a rule, such removal is most undesirable on the ground of the greater expense. There are, however, some instances in which the compensation which has been awarded is notably inadequate; and in order to secure a full and equitable compensation I do not see why such a limitation should not be removed, subject to the check of the trial being had in exceptional cases, but in those only, in a superior Court to which I have referred. I have only a word to add, and that is with regard to the question raised about the painters. It seems, from all I have heard, that this is a matter of fact which can readily and easily be cleared up; but that matter of fact cannot be cleared up by hearing only one side. As a member of the London Conciliation Board, which has been fairly successful, I can state that the very foundation of success is that the working classes should be fairly convinced that both sides shall equally gain a hearing; and there can be no conciliation unless that principle be rigorously carried out. I am glad to know that it has evidently been carried out as a general practice, though apparently not in this instance, by the right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench (Right Hon. D. R. Plunket). There is no one who is not aware of the difficulties he must have in dealing with these questions of wages. I am glad to see that even the hon. Gentleman the Member for Nottingham fully recognises the great care and discrimination exercised by the right hon. Gentleman generally. May I suggest that the right hon. Gentleman will at any rate—even if it be superfluous—it will give satisfaction—reinvestigate the matter, and afford an opportunity to all interested to be heard, a practice which is not only requisite for full knowledge and justice, but which is the very basis of all conciliation, and so of the resulting benefit of good relations between employers and employed.

(1.30.) **SIR JOSEPH W. PEASE** (Durham): I do not propose to follow

the arguments on the Employers' Liability Act. I think that this debate ought to have taken place in Committee of the House on the Bill itself. I had the honour of sitting on the Committee on that Bill, and these points, which my hon. Friend opposite has made, were discussed from time to time in their proper place on that Committee. All I shall do is to ask Her Majesty's Government, as speedily as possible, to deal with that Act, many portions of which are capable of being modified and amended. I wish to say a few words on a subject which I had intended to bring before the House last evening, but unfortunately I was not in my place when it came on. Many friends of mine in the country who have taken a large interest in the question of the Indian opium trade were disappointed on finding that there was nothing in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech with regard to the question which came before the House, and which was decided by the House in terms which were quite unmistakeable. And these terms were to urge upon the Indian Government to cease to grant licences for the cultivation of the poppy, as the revenue raised by them was immoral and indefensible. Some of us are anxious to know whether Her Majesty's Government have had any communication with the Indian Government on the subject. The question I introduced to the House on the 10th of April last was the cultivation of the poppy and the trade generally in opium. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, whose loss all of us very sincerely deplore, took credit for Her Majesty's Government that they had during the last five years decreased the area which was under the cultivation of the poppy. So far that was very satisfactory to those of us who are warring against the cultivation of the poppy in India. But what we want to know from Her Majesty's Government, though this perhaps is not a very suitable occasion to ask for the information, is whether this Resolution has been communicated to the Government in India, and what steps they propose to take with regard to the question? The right hon. Gentleman the late leader of the House admitted practically that the cultivation of the

poppy was immoral in its action on the whole population of India and China, to which the trade more particularly applied. I am anxious to know what the Indian Government have to say to the question. I have in my pocket a Bill in which the Government of Victoria in Australia propose absolutely to put an end by very heavy penalties to the opium consumption in that colony. It was brought forward by two responsible members of that Government, and I have been told by a late member of that Government that, in all human probability, this Bill will be passed by a very large majority in the colony of Victoria. Now, Sir, this shows practically what is the view of these men, who are acting upon their own judgment and own responsibility in the Government of that country. They emphatically endorse these allegations which we have made, that the trade in opium carried on by the Government of India is immoral and indefensible.

(1.37.) MR. ROBERT GRANT WEBSTER (St. Pancras): One might naturally feel surprised that there has been no reference made by any Member of the Opposition with regard to the fact stated in the Speech from the Throne that Her Majesty has lost in the Viceroy of Egypt a loyal ally, whose wise government had, in the space of a few years, largely contributed to restore prosperity and peace to that country. The fact of our remaining in Egypt at the present time has not been referred to, although that fact was made by Members of the Opposition a matter of considerable animadversion. Why is it? I believe it is because it has come to the mind of the Opposition that our remaining in Egypt at the present time is not only essential to the prosperity of Egypt, but essential to our commercial prosperity. We have since our arrival in Egypt carried out a number of reliable remedies, but not without very great difficulty. The *courbash* has been abolished; sanitation and education have been improved; and also slavery, to a very great extent, has been suppressed. I think that is a very good record for this Government, when we recollect that when this Government came into office the state of Egypt was in an eminently un-

*Sir Joseph W. Pease*

tisfactory condition. This being the state of things, it is no wonder that gentlemen on the Opposition Benches have very little to say in this House regarding the question of Egypt. Turning to the reference in regard toanzibar, the Government have been able to make satisfactory statements at a treaty has been made with His Highness the Sultan, and that in consequence there would be opened out to British trade and commerce a very large portion of the East African Coast. owing to the hostile tariffs with which any foreign countries have recently edged round their countries, an export trade to many has been gradually diminishing, therefore the extension of our markets to new, if at present only partially developed, countries is a matter for congratulation. The hon. member for North West Lanarkshire (Mr. Cuninghame Graham) complained the Bill to provide allotments in the country. The hon. Gentleman has always advocated the system of State Socialism, but when we remember that we are a very highly civilised community, and have been so for centuries, it appears to me that any attempt to hand over the whole of the land of the country to Councils, to be parcelled out by them to the agricultural labourer, would be absolutely and completely unworkable. In looking over the Queen's Speech I find there are two very important measures to be brought in with regard to Ireland. A large number of the Unionist Members at the last general election, in their election addresses, stated that they would be willing to vote for a further extension of local self government in England and in Scotland, and to do the same with regard to Ireland when the time was ripe for such a change. Sir, that time has arrived, the conditions of affairs in Ireland have improved, five or six thousand people who had to go about their business day by day guarded by policemen, and were subject to the cruel tyranny of the boycotting system, are now as free as any of our constituents in St. Pancras. The catalogue of serious crime has greatly diminished, and that being so, and having regard to the comparative quietude that prevails, I think the time

has arrived to pass a measure of local government for Ireland. There is another clause in the gracious Speech from the Throne we are considering; a scheme to extend the advantages of assisted education to Ireland. A great deal of objection was made yesterday as to a statement of the Prime Minister that some of the people of Ireland were backward. I think we are enabled, by statistics, to show that in some Irish constituencies one-half of the people who go to the poll claim to vote as illiterates, and we must acknowledge that if they have not the education necessary to enable them to put their names to a voting paper, the state of education in Ireland cannot be altogether satisfactory. I have reason to believe that in many instances other reasons besides want of education may induce them to claim as illiterates, which I hope to have an opportunity of referring to later this Session. There was also an attack made on the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby on a statement of the Prime Minister that County Councils have not, up to the present time, conducted to economy. I do not believe that when these Councils have got into thorough good working order there will be any permanent increase on the rates; but as far as London is concerned, the County Council system has up to now proved a most expensive and a not altogether satisfactory experiment. We shall all welcome the introduction into London of the District Councils Bill. London is at the present time under a variety of bodies, and it would be desirable to have District Councils. The Vestries have, in some instances, done remarkably good work, in others they have not done so, and though we generally do not desire to do away with the old divisions we should in London welcome District Councils as a valuable link in the chain of good local self-government. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby also attacked the Prime Minister for certain statements he had made in regard to the people of Ireland. It was difficult exactly to follow of what he complained. He further said such statements would offend the people of America, though

why the statement that a few of the inhabitants of these Isles were backward should cause offence in America, or anywhere else, it is difficult to comprehend. The last speaker complained that the Government did not propose to do away with the opium traffic. I know something of this subject, and I know that a very great deal of the opium used in China does not come from India at all, but from China itself. The use of the drug at all is, of course, to be deplored; but whether it come from India or not, the people of China would unfortunately continue to use that drug. In considering this matter the House must remember that if we do away with that traffic we shall have to consider the question of the revenues of India. At present silver is decreasing considerably in value, and that will materially affect the finances of India; therefore, if this alteration is to take place, it ought to be made gradually, and not at one fell swoop.

(1.45.) MR. T. H. BOLTON (St. Pancras, N.): I am sorry, Sir, I cannot agree with the sanguine expectation, expressed by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, as to the intentions of the Government respecting the District Councils Bill. The paragraph in the most gracious Speech from the Throne is certainly very vague, and is not very encouraging; but the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House last night was very discouraging. He gave a long list of measures of great importance, and he led us to think that there was no hope for the District Councils Bill unless all those measures were satisfactorily disposed of. If that is the way the Government approach this subject we can only draw one conclusion, and that is that they do not seriously intend to deal with the question of District Councils, either in London or throughout the country, this year.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): We do seriously intend to deal with the question; but whether we have the power or not depends upon the hon. Gentleman.

MR. T. H. BOLTON: If the power depends upon me, the Government will have ample opportunity of dealing with

the question, because of all the measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I believe this is one of the most practical and most necessary. The want of a District Councils Bill paralyses the action of County Councils, and paralyses the action of the municipal authorities in this city. I heard yesterday the expression of a hope that the Government would embody in a Small Holdings Bill provisions not only for the purchase of small holdings, but for the leasing of land, and for the subletting of such leased land to persons desirous of occupying holdings. How is it possible to carry out any idea of that kind without District Councils? To suggest that County Councils with their wide areas and wide jurisdiction should lease and let land would be absurd. To hand over to Boards of Guardians the control of such business would be unsatisfactory, and to suggest that the present unsatisfactory parish vestries should deal with such matters would be worse still. How it is possible to give effect to the very valuable and practical suggestion that land should be leased and sub-let, as well as sold, to persons desiring to use it, without District Councils, I cannot for the life of me understand. I can quite understand that there may be a disinclination on the part of the Government to establish Elective Councils for parishes, and it may be preferable that there should be a reformed vestry, or reformed assembly of the parish generally, rather than the creation of a Parochial Board; but there should be no hesitation in carrying out what the Government is committed to in principle, namely, the establishment of District Councils to assist County Councils to deal with those matters, local in their character, which the County Councils cannot so well attend to. If this matter is to be a pious opinion, without a serious intention on the part of the Government, it will go far to destroy the prospect or hope of anything being done this Session in connection with land reform in the country districts of England. I cannot too strongly press upon the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House the importance of this portion of the Government programme. I feel that in

*Mr. Robert Grant Webster*

London, especially, there is a strong desire to have a reformed vestry system, so that the London County Council may be improved and able to deal satisfactorily with purely local questions. The London County Council is over-loaded with parochial work. At present there is a disinclination to hand over that work to the vestries. Although the larger and more important vestries do their work very well, some do not do it so well. The absence of District Councils, having the confidence of the people, prevents the County Council from confining its attention to those larger matters to which its attention ought to be confined, leaving the smaller but very important work to the districts. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give a more earnest assurance as to the desire of the Government to deal with this question of District Councils this Session. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby spoke last night of the programme of the Government consisting only of remanets. I do not object to have remanets disposed of. I do not know that it is unsatisfactory for the Government, towards the close of a Parliament, to try to pass those measures that have been repeatedly before the House. If the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House presses forward a good District Councils Bill there are many on this side of the House who will help him; but to suggest that this measure may be brought forward only after a long list of difficult measures are carried, is to show us that there is no intention of dealing with the matter this Session. I feel justified in making this appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to give us a stronger and more definite assurance that the Government will put forward this measure soon, not only in the interests of London but of the country at large.

(2.15.) MR. AINSLIE (Lancashire, N. Lonsdale): I should not have risen on this occasion at all, had it not been for the remarks which have been made by the hon. Member for Nottingham with regard to the Employers' Liability Bill, in which I took some part two years ago. He has made an omission in reference thereto which I venture

to supplement. He alluded to the fact that the Government did not press forward the Bill on the last occasion with the energy which they might have displayed. In my own opinion the Government did what was in their power. They had, for reasons of their own, delegated the work of dealing with the Bill to one of the Grand Committees—the Committee on Law—and, if I may venture to say so, I think their action in that respect rather failed in effecting the object which they had in view. It brought too many persons, who were not specially concerned in the matter, into the Committee room, and the ultimate effect was the failure of the Bill to be passed. The hon. Member for Nottingham's action on that occasion is very well known. He has always taken a very strong leading part in objecting to certain clauses in that Bill, or rather in the two Bills which have been before us, and I cannot blame him for the action which he takes as representing a large body of Trades Unionists. But he has omitted to refer to the action taken by another leading representative of a large body of men in this country in his time, though, unfortunately, his well-known face is missed from those benches. I refer to the late Mr. Bradlaugh, whom I regarded as quite as much an exponent of the opinions of the working classes as the Member for Nottingham. His support on the last occasion was given unstintingly to the Government measure, even though he held an opinion that, on some one or two points, amendments might still be made with advantage. Now, I have to say, representing as I do a very large working-class community, that it would not do for the Government to neglect to pass this Bill this Session, if by any possibility it can be carried. I want to support the suggestion that the Government should place this measure in a somewhat forward position. It will redound to their credit if they can do so; but it will do very much more, for it will show to the public, and the great body of the working classes, that Governments can do something, and are ready to do something, when they are asked. But it will not do, no mat-

ter what Government may be in power, for a measure of this sort to be brought in year after year, and then laid aside, as alleged, for want of time. The obstacles which the Government have met with have not been from this side of the House. The hon. Member opposite seemed to be under two impressions: one was that the Government could not possibly last more than one Session; and the other, evidently, that the Government must last longer, or else it would not have urged them to pass this measure. Because, if a Government is to be formed by right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite benches, naturally it would have their support to pass the Bill, and he would not have to ask us on these Benches to carry it. The reference of the Bill to a Grand Committee was, as I have said, a technical mistake. I hope the Government will not repeat it, but will offer a Special Committee, and that it will go before a Committee of the whole House, and not such a Committee as that on Law or on Trade. This is one of those occasions when something may be done by a conference of those who have the subject at heart, for the points of difference between us are not so great but that they may be settled, and I hope the hon. Member will show a disposition to assist the Government in passing this measure. If he does so, he shall receive every assistance at my hands in forwarding the Bill.

(2.25.) MR. BRYCE: I see the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his place, and I desire to have this opportunity of asking one or two questions with regard to foreign affairs, to which I hope he will find it possible to give me an answer, though, if not, I shall be glad if he can do so on the next occasion. I am glad to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Gentleman on his appointment to a post in the Government, and to express the confident hope that the same qualities that distinguished him when he represented the Charity Commission will not fail him in the more responsible office he now fills. I should like, in asking a question with regard to the Consulship at Erzeroum, which has been vacant for some time, and which, I hope, he will be able to tell

*Mr. Ainslie*

us will be filled up, to pay, in passing, a tribute to the distinguished qualities and services of our late Ambassador at Constantinople. I think Her Majesty had not, in the Diplomatic Service, a man of greater powers of mind than the late Sir William White; a man of extensive knowledge of all foreign affairs and great technical skill in handling diplomatic business, which entitled him to the confidence of Her Majesty and this country. His loss has been very great to British interests in the East, and it is one which it will be very hard for anyone else to supply. I wish to ask the hon. Gentleman who has been appointed to succeed Mr. Clifford Lloyd at Erzeroum, and whether it is intended that Erzeroum shall be still the principal Consulship in that part of Asiatic Turkey, which has practically been the centre of the district in which most of the disturbances occurred? It is a matter, therefore, of considerable importance that a man of judgment, and tact, and knowledge, should fill the post. The hon. Gentleman will perhaps tell us when it is intended to present any further Papers relating to the state of affairs in Armenia and Asiatic Turkey generally? There is reference made in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech to the progress of negotiations with regard to the settlement of the Sealing question in the Behring Sea. That reference, however, is rather indefinite, and I hope the Under Secretary can tell us in what precise position the negotiations now stand? I see the American papers state that the delays which have occurred have been owing to Her Majesty's Government. I should think that statement is probably incorrect, but we shall be glad to know that everything has been done on the part of Her Majesty's Government to accelerate the arbitration; and in particular we should like to know whether it has yet been settled how the other arbitrators, in addition to those to be named by the United States, are to be selected: whether the Government have agreed upon them; or whether they have agreed upon the Governments who are to be asked to name the arbitrators? The hon. Gentleman will perhaps also tell us when further Papers with regard to these

matters will be presented? As regards the Newfoundland Fisheries, I think the House will be glad to learn what is the position of affairs in the Colony at present, and whether arrangements have been made for the passing of the Act which the Colonial Government undertook to have passed in the Newfoundland Legislature? It is a good many months since the preliminary agreement with the French Government was arrived at, and we have not heard since then whether the French Government has presented that agreement to the Legislature for its acceptance, nor when it is likely that the agreement can be presented. The matter is one which in times past has caused much friction, and is at all times apt to involve fresh friction, and we shall be glad, therefore, to know if there is a reasonable prospect of this matter being settled? The questions pending between the United States and this country and Canada are remaining in abeyance, and if the hon. Gentleman has any information to give us with regard to them we shall be glad to have it. There is one more subject on which I shall be glad to have information. It is the Convention for the regulation of the liquor traffic in the North Sea. Six years ago an agreement was entered into between the representatives of the different Powers, whose territories adjoined the North Sea, for a scheme by which the liquor traffic carried on by the vessels going to the fisheries there should be put under some restriction. At present very great harm follows from the sale of liquor on the liquor boats or floating taverns; and it has been felt by those interested in the condition of the fishermen, not only of our own country, but by those interested in the Danish, Dutch, and German fishermen, that an international regulation of the matter would be of great advantage. In 1886 a Convention was made for that purpose, and it has been ratified by every Power except France, and I hope we shall be told now that the French Government will bring the matter before their Legislature again, and that there is a prospect that it will be accepted. This matter involves no political considerations, and yet the necessary arrangement can only be carried out by the combined action of

the different Powers concerned. The point, therefore, is one of considerable importance, and it is one in which the enlightened public opinion of France, as well as of this country, would act upon the Legislature if the facts were known. I hope the hon. Member will be able to give us further assurances on this subject.

\*(2.25.) MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): There is one subject which has not been alluded to by my hon. Friend below me, and that is, as to the state of the negotiations with regard to the Brussels Conference on the Repression of the Slave Trade. When the subject was last heard of the bulk of the Powers concerned had given their assent to the suggestions of the Conference, but France and Portugal were still outstanding; and we shall be glad to know whether pressure can be exercised by the Government of this country, which took the initiative in having that Conference summoned, so that its labours should not be abortive.

\*(2.27.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Allow me, in the first place, to thank my hon. Friend opposite for the very kind expressions which he has used personally to myself. I hope that, whether the time be short or long which I have to serve in the office I now fill, I shall deserve the kind expressions which the hon. Gentleman opposite has used. With regard to the first question which the hon. Gentleman has put to me, I am able to inform him that the Consulship at Erzeroum has been filled up by the appointment of Mr. R. W. Graves. This gentleman was originally a student interpreter; he subsequently served as Vice Consul at Sophia, and he for a considerable time occupied the same post at Philippopolis. I believe that it is intended that Erzeroum shall still occupy the prominent position which it is in at present in regard to Armenian affairs. As to laying Papers upon the Armenian question upon the Table of the House, I will make inquiries in the Office as to whether it is possible to do so. I do not conceive that any objection can be made to laying such Papers; but the affairs of Armenia have been very quiet during the last few



months, and I do not anticipate that the Papers will be either full or lengthy. I will, however, endeavour to see whether there are materials existing for a Blue Book which can be laid before the House. I may, perhaps, add that it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to lay upon the table of the House Papers relating to the riots in China, which have excited a considerable amount of attention, and also Papers with regard to the Behring Sea negotiations, and also Papers in regard to the revolution in Chili. In regard to commercial matters, it is also intended to lay Papers dealing with the commercial matters of Europe in two volumes; the first volume of which will not include any reference to the recent Commercial Treaties which have been arranged by the Central Powers of Europe, nor with regard to the recent tariff arrangements made in France; but the second volume will include those Papers. With regard to the Behring Sea dispute, I am happy to be able to inform the hon. Gentleman that a complete agreement has been arrived at between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States. The points of arbitration have been decided upon, and the Powers who are to be asked to appoint the arbitrators have also been agreed upon. Those Powers are Italy, France and Sweden; but I ought to add that the Governments of those Powers have not yet been asked whether they will agree to appoint arbitrators as proposed; but so far as Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States are concerned, they have come to an agreement to ask these Powers to appoint arbitrators. In addition to that, it is also agreed between our Government and the Government of the United States that we shall be represented by two arbitrators upon the Board of Arbitration, and that the United States shall be equally represented. Then as to the Commission which was appointed for investigating on the spot into the character of the necessary precautions which may be required for the maintenance of seal life in the Behring Sea, that Commission has completed its labours, so far as their individual investigations are concerned. The British

*Mr. J. W. Lowther*

and American Commissioners have now met at Washington, and they are just on the point of entering upon the consideration of their joint Report. In regard to Newfoundland, I am afraid that matters have not advanced very rapidly; but the draft Bill which the Newfoundland Government have undertaken to pass into an Act has been seen by Her Majesty's Government, and it now only awaits introduction to the Newfoundland Legislature. I believe some slight delay has arisen through the temporary absence from Newfoundland of one or two gentlemen who came over here as delegates, and are, therefore, seized with special knowledge of the subject, but on their return to Newfoundland the matter will be proceeded with. As to the negotiations with France, upon that matter the French Government have not yet, I believe, presented for ratification to their Chamber the agreement for arbitration. I am afraid I cannot give the hon. Gentleman very definite information on this matter, and if he requires anything further, I will ask him to put a question on the Paper. As to the North Sea Fisheries Convention, I understand that in that case also the French Government have not, up to the present, taken any measures for ratifying the Convention of 1886. Only quite recently we were approached by the German Government, and asked what steps were being taken in the matter; and we informed the German Government that, as Holland was the convoking Power, it rested with the Dutch Government to get ratification of the Convention that was made. The hon. Member opposite asked with regard to the Brussels Convention. I am happy to be able to say that the Brussels Act has been practically ratified; the French Government have ratified it with certain modifications, though the ratification by the Portuguese Government still remains in abeyance. The Portuguese Legislature is occupied at the present time with domestic matters of great interest, and it is possible some time may yet elapse before that Government is in a position to bring before the Legislature proposals for the ratification of the Brussels Act. But Her Majesty's Government do not anticipate that any difficulty will

be created beyond the lapse of time which unfortunately must occur.

**\*(2.50.) THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.):** The hon. Member asked whether there was any hope of the Employers' Liability Bill being presented and prosecuted this Session. That is a subject on which I have every hope of seeing effective legislation this Session, and I should be extremely disappointed if this Parliament came to an end without my having an opportunity of asking the judgment of the House upon it. It is a measure on which I have spent much time and trouble, and which has caused me much anxiety. Nothing has disappointed me more, in the course of my short official career, than the failure of the attempts I have made, on two occasions, to improve the law on this most important subject. The opening remarks of the hon. Member for Nottingham filled me with the liveliest hopes; he began by promising his co-operation, but from the later portion of his speech it turned out that that co-operation was only to be given on the absolute surrender of the Government; and that if a complete surrender is not made, the Bill will be met with the same dogged opposition as was displayed before. It is the fault of the hon. Member for Nottingham that the question has not been dealt with before now. The Bill I introduced in 1888 was based on the Report of a Committee of this House, appointed by a Government of which the hon. Member was himself a member, and was composed of a majority of his own political friends. The Inquiry by that Committee was full and exhaustive. I believe that every one of the views which the hon. Member has put before the House were discussed before that Committee. The Committee made a Report to this House, and upon that Report was based the Bill which I presented to the House; and I believe I did not disregard one of the recommendations of that Report, some of which were extremely obscure, one in particular, Clause 3, caused me certainly hours of labour in endeavouring to put it into practical shape. I honestly endeavoured to give effect to every recom-

mendation of that Committee in my Bill; and what is more, I went beyond the recommendations of the Committee, and met many of the blots which legal decisions had searched out in the language of the former Bill, to the prejudice of the working man seeking compensation under its provisions. Many decisions had been given which were looked upon, and deservedly so, as detracting from the merits of the Act, and these were meant to be counteracted by my Bill of 1888. What was the course of the hon. Member for Nottingham? A great deal of the time of the House was consumed in the discussion of that Bill; it then went before a Grand Committee upstairs, and its provisions were subjected to a minute and searching examination by Members of all Parties in the House, and it then came back to this House late in the year, when the Session was drawing to a close, and the course of the hon. Member was, instead of showing any anxiety to forward enactments which were improvements, even if they did not go so far as he desired, which were alterations in the interests of working men and for the benefit of those classes whom he claimed in a special manner to represent—instead of co-operating in the passing of that Bill, he, at the last moment, chose to raise a question which of itself must require much discussion and consideration to give effect to it—the question of what was known as the doctrine of Common Employment. That is a legal doctrine of far-reaching character, requiring to be considered from every conceivable point of view. The legal ground upon which that doctrine rests is that a man who has virtually agreed to undertake to expose himself to certain risks ought not when mischief follows to turn round and claim compensation. That is the reasonable ground of the doctrine of common employment. I quite agree that there is great difficulty in applying the doctrine to certain cases, in finding out where there was a real undertaking of the risk, so that no claim for damages arises. I think there is some need for amendment of the law in the definition of common employment, but the difficulties involved in that subject are most difficult to resolve.

To a man desiring to do justice to both employers and employed it is a question requiring careful and deliberate consideration, and to foist that principle into a Bill at the last moment was to deliberately wreck the Bill. The hon. Member thought it right to take a course which ended in the loss of the Bill of 1888, which, I believe, embodied the last and best recommendations of a Committee of this House on the subject, and it was a decided advance on the existing law. Not only that, but it was an advance on the hon. Member's own Bill. In 1886 the hon. Member put his name on the back of a Bill, on which was also the honoured name of the hon. Member for Morpeth. The Bill I presented in 1888, which the hon. Member wrecked by his action, was a great advance on that. But in that year these new lights had not dawned on the hon. Member's mind, and he had not introduced in his Bill any words destroying the doctrine of common employment. In that Bill the hon. Member embodied his last and best theories, and then he was not prepared to make those startling changes in the law which he suggested to the House, at the eleventh hour, in my Bill, after careful consideration by a Grand Committee. The stimulating effect of being two years in opposition to a Conservative Government was yet to come. All I can say is that the hon. Member did cause the rejection of a Bill which was a great advance on his own Bill of 1886, by introducing at the last moment an Amendment which would require some months of discussion. Let, therefore, the responsibility be thrown on the shoulders which ought to bear it. The hon. Member for Nottingham is responsible for the fact that this question has not advanced very much. For instance, there is the practical suggestion which the hon. Member for South Islington made to-day, with reference to the injustice worked by the rule as to six weeks' notice, the want of which destroyed the workman's right to compensation on a technical point, and the question of the amount of compensation. Both these matters were dealt with in my Bill of 1888—I will not say in a manner completely satisfactory, but in a manner not completely

unsatisfactory, and were capable of being improved by any rational and practical mind dealing with it in the House, without going into the doctrine of common employment. If the hon. Member had applied his mind to the Notice Clause of my Bill, and the increased compensation it gave, he would have rendered more practical service to those whom he claims to represent than by pursuing the course he did. I assure the hon. Member I desire to act justly to all classes in this question, and I shall endeavour to do so. Important inquiries are going on at this moment in relation to cognate subjects to this, before the Royal Commission on Labour, and I hope a great deal has already been learned from the evidence given. I trust also that long before the Session has closed some assistance may be got from the evidence with regard to the clauses of the Act. There is no Bill about which I shall feel more anxiety, and there is no Bill upon which I shall be more glad of the assistance of all those who are entitled to speak on the question. At the same time, my hope is strong, and has not been destroyed by the speech of the hon. Member to-night; but he must remember that this Bill does not take the first place in the programme of the Government, and there are other measures which must have precedence, and I can only hope that the hon. Member and his friends will allow these measures to pass with sufficient rapidity to enable me to bring forward this Bill, which would confer as great benefit on the country as any other proposed in the Queen's Speech. The hon. Member has not condescended to study that part of the Factory Act of last year which deals with the question of certifying surgeons, and a little time spent in such study would not have been wasted. He supposes also that it will increase the labours of the Factory Inspectors. †It diminishes in an enormous degree what they have to do. It takes away the whole sanitary inspection of workshops and gives it to the officials of the Local Authority; therefore, when the hon. Member clamours for the increase of Factory Inspectors, he shows that he has not been at the trouble of considering the provisions of the Bill to which he refers. I have already made an addition to the staff

*Mr. H. Matthews*

of Inspectors in the direction in which it was wanted—in the due administration of the Cotton Cloth Factories Act of 1889. Under that Act an amount of inspection was required by law, which the existing staff of Inspectors could not carry out. It was by no means easy to select men competent to administer that Act, which involves a wide knowledge of instruments and various technicalities; but after careful consideration I have selected gentlemen who have either undergone, or are now undergoing, examination by the Civil Service Commissioners, and they will then be appointed Factory Inspectors in Lancashire, and I hope the proposed additional expenditure will receive the sanction of the Treasury.

(3.0.) MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.) : We have now arrived at the time when it was understood the Debate should be adjourned and I move that the Debate be now adjourned.

Debate further adjourned till tomorrow.

## MOTIONS.

### SHOP HOURS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to amend the Law relating to the employment of women and young people in shops, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Hermon-Hodge, Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Provand.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 26.]

### TENURE OF LAND BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Ellis, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Tenure of Land in Wales, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Ellis, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Lloyd-George, and Mr. Samuel Evans.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 27.]

### PLACES OF WORSHIP ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Bryn Roberts, Bill to provide for the enfranchisement of Leasehold Places of Worship, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Waddy, Mr. David Randell, and Mr. John Kelly.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 28.]

### MINES EIGHT HOURS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Leake, Bill to restrict labour in mines to eight hours per day, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Leake, Mr. William Abraham, Mr. Pickard, Mr. David Randell, Mr. Philipps, Mr. Roby, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Spencer Balfour, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Philip Stanhope, Earl Compton, and Sir Walter Foster.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 29.]

### PURCHASE OF LAND AND CONGESTED DISTRICTS (IRELAND) ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Roche, Bill to amend "The Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Act, 1891," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Roche, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. William O'Brien, and Mr. Knox.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 30.]

### RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Gerald Balfour, Bill to amend the Law relating to the rating of hereditaments containing machinery, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour, Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Mather, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Winterbotham, Sir William Houldsworth, and Mr. Smith Wright.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 31.]

### EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Kelly, Bill for the reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Clancy, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Timothy Harrington, and Mr. Pierce Mahony.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 32.]

### LOCAL AUTHORITIES (PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Haldane, Bill to enable Local Authorities to value and purchase Land, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Sydney Buxton, and Mr. Munro Ferguson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 33.]

### MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Condon, Bill to amend the Law relating to Municipal Franchise in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Condon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Pinkerton, Mr. O'Keeffe, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Maurice Healy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 34.]

### MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mattinson, Bill to amend "The Municipal Corporations Act, 1882," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Mattinson, Mr. Cross, Mr. W. F. Lawrence, and Mr. Royden.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 35.]

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION  
TO WOMEN) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Albert Rollit, Bill to extend the Parliamentary Franchise to Women, ordered to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Algernon Borthwick, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Walter M'Laren, Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Ernest Spencer.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 36.]

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION  
TO WOMEN) (No. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Walter M'Laren, Bill to extend the Parliamentary Franchise, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Walter M'Laren, Sir Algernon Borthwick, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Sir Edward Watkin, Baron Dimsdale, Dr. Cameron, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Webb, Mr. Byron Reed, and Mr. Maclure.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 37.]

ELECTORS QUALIFICATION AND REGISTRA-  
TION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stansfeld, Bill to amend the Law with respect to the Qualification and Registration of Electors at Parliamentary, Municipal, and County Elections in England and Wales, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Stansfeld, Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir Horace Davey, and Mr. Asquith.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 38.]

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Joseph Nolan, Bill to amend the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Joseph Nolan, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Leamy, and Mr. John O'Connor.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 39.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO  
CHILDREN BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill to amend and extend the Law relating to the prohibition of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children, and for other purposes connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Walter M'Laren, Mr. Channing, Mr. Henry J. Wilson, and Mr. Octavius V. Morgan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 40.]

STEAM ENGINES (PERSONS IN CHARGE)  
BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Fenwick, Bill to provide for Certificates to Persons in Charge of Steam Engines and Boilers on Land, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Pickard, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Seton-Karr.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 41.]

PLURAL VOTING (ABOLITION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Bill to provide that no person shall vote upon Parliamentary Elections in more than one electoral area during one electoral year, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Sir William Harcourt, Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir Horace Davey, and Mr. Asquith.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 42.]

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1887)  
AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Pritchard Morgan, Bill to amend the Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1887, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Pritchard Morgan, Mr. Pickard, Mr. David Randell, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Jacoby, and Mr. Cremer.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 43.]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Ernest Spencer, Bill to establish a Department of Labour, to be presided over by a Minister to be called the Labour Minister, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ernest Spencer, Sir Albert Rollit, and Sir Joseph Pease.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 44.]

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (BANFF) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Duff, Bill to make better provision for the administration of certain Educational Endowments in the County of Banff, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Duff, Mr. Asher, and Mr. James Campbell.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 45.]

PENSIONS (OLD AGE) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Walter Foster, Bill to provide Pensions for poor persons over the age of sixty-five years, ordered to be brought in by Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Alfred Thomas, and Mr. Spencer Balfour.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 46.]

LEASEHOLDERS (PURCHASE OF FEE  
SIMPLE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lawson, Bill to give facilities to Leaseholders for the purchase of the Fee Simple of their Holdings, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lawson.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) (No. 2)  
BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John O'Connor, Bill to regulate the franchise in municipalities and townships in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Timothy Harrington, and Mr. William Redmond.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 47.]

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOT-  
LAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. M'Lagan, Bill to enable owners and occupiers in burghs, parishes, and

districts in Scotland to prevent the common sale of intoxicating liquors, or otherwise to have effectual control over the drink traffic within such areas, ordered to be brought in by Mr. M'Lagan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Lyell, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Dr. Clark, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. John Wilson, and Mr. Mark Stewart.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 48.]

#### RETURNING OFFICERS' EXPENSES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Esslemont, Bill to provide for the payment of Expenses to be incurred by Returning Officers at Parliamentary Elections in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Esslemont, Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. Marjoribanks, Mr. M'Ewan, Mr. Munro Ferguson, and Dr. Clark.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 49.]

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAYS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Broadhurst, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Octavius V. Morgan, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, and Mr. Charles Wilson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 50.]

#### COMPULSORY SALE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Bill to provide for the Compulsory Sale of Land in certain cases in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Knox, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Matthew Kenny, Mr. M'Cartan, and Mr. Pinkerton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 51.]

#### LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS (1881 AND 1887) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Fitzgerald, Bill to amend the Land Law (Ireland) Acts, 1881 and 1887, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Fitzgerald, Mr. T. Harrington, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Mahony, and Mr. William Redmond.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 52.]

#### RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Buchanan, Bill to confer on County Councils in Scotland the power of maintaining and protecting Rights of Way and otherwise to amend the Law relating to Rights of Way in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Asher, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Dr. Farquharson, and Mr. Shiress Will.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 53.]

#### FIRE BRIGADES (EXEMPTION FROM JURY SERVICE) BILL.

On Motion of Viscount Curzon, Bill to exempt members of Fire Brigades from service on juries, ordered to be brought in by Viscount Curzon, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Dixon Hartland, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Gully, Mr. Baird, and Sir Albert Rollit.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 54.]

#### CHURCH BUILDING ACTS (COMPULSORY POWERS REPEAL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Powell, Bill to repeal the provisions of the Church Building Acts relating to the compulsory purchase of sites for churches and burial grounds, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Powell, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Tomlinson, and Mr. Addison.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 55.]

#### BOILERS INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir Edmund Lechmere, Bill to provide for the Inspection and Registration of Boilers, ordered to be brought in by Sir Edmund Lechmere, Mr. Hermon-Hodge, Mr. Mather, Mr. Burt, Mr. Coddington, Sir William Houldsworth, and Mr. Maclean.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 56.]

#### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Leon, Bill to amend the Law as to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Leon, Mr. Colman, Mr. Furness, Mr. John Kelly, Mr. Lambert, and Mr. Logan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 57.]

#### TENURE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Dickson, Bill to amend the Law relating to the tenure of Land in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Dillon, Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Mr. M'Dermott.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 58.]

#### HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Keeffe, Bill for making better provision for the housing of the working classes in Irish cities and towns, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Keeffe, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Murphy, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Maurice Healy, and Mr. Webb.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 59.]

#### OLD AGE PROVIDENT PENSIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Bartley, Bill to provide pensions in old age to the provident poor, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bartley, Mr. Maclean, and Mr. Seager Hunt.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 60.]

#### POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Webb, Bill to amend the Law relating to the constitution and election of Board of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Webb, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Deasy, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick), Mr. Hammond, and Mr. Patrick Joseph O'Brien.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 61.]

#### UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Harrison, Bill to afford increased facilities for University Education

in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harrison, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Clancy, and Mr. John Redmond.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 62.]

#### INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Johnston, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland, on Saturday and Sunday, and for other purposes connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Johnston, Mr. Lea, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Mahony, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Jordan, Sir Charles Lewis, Mr. William Corbett, and Mr. O'Neill.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 63.]

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Kilbride, Bill to improve the position of National School Teachers in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Knox, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. Cox.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 64.]

#### GOVERNMENT OF SCOTLAND BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hunter, Bill to amend the provision for the future Government of Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hunter, Mr. Laing Brown, Mr. Buchanan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Esslemont, Sir John Kinloch, Mr. Leng, Mr. Philipps, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Shiress Will, and Mr. John Wilson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 65.]

#### PIG IRON WARRANTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hingley, Bill to regulate dealings in Pig Iron, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hingley, Mr. Ainslie, and Mr. Isaac Wilson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 66.]

#### POOR RATE (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Pickersgill, Bill to provide for the equal distribution over the Metropolis of a further portion of the expenses charged to the Poor Rate; and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Howell, and Mr. Sydney Buxton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 67.]

#### AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Agricultural Holdings in England and Wales; and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. Arthur Williams, and Mr. Lambert.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 68.]

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Tuite, Bill to improve the condition of Agricultural and other Labourers in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Tuite, Mr. Dillon, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr.

Sexton, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Donal Sullivan, and Mr. Finucane.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 69.]

#### OUTDOOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cox, Bill to amend the Law relating to the distribution of Outdoor Relief in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cox, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Barry, Mr. Flynn, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Coltery, and Sir Thomas Esmonde.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 70.]

#### TOWN HOLDINGS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Hanlon, Bill to amend the Law relating to Town Holdings in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Hanlon, Mr. Mahony, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Carew, and Mr. Harrington.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 71.]

#### PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dillon, Bill to make better provision for the construction of Piers and Harbours in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Dillon, Mr. Barry, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. Deasy, Mr. Pinkerton, and Mr. Webb.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 72.]

#### HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stern, Bill for the purpose of facilitating the operation of "The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890," in so far as it relates to rural sanitary districts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Stern, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Francis Stevenson, and Mr. Brand.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 73.]

#### FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conway, Bill to amend the Law relating to Fisheries in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Conway, Mr. Mahony, Mr. William Corbet, and Mr. Nolan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 74.]

#### BURIALS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Osborne Morgan, Bill further to amend the Burial Laws, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Channing, Mr. John Ellis, and Mr. Illingworth.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 75.]

#### RAILWAY SHAREHOLDERS (LICENSING SESSIONS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Maclure, Bill to remove the disabilities of Railway and other Shareholders in public companies from acting at Licensing Sessions, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Maclure, Mr. Coddington, and Mr. Fielden.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 76.]

#### EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Burt, Bill to amend "The Employers' Liability Act, 1880," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, and Mr. Lockwood.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 77.]

**PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Sheehy, Bill to amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Elections, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sheehy, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Matthew Kenny, Mr. Knox, and Sir Thomas Esmonde.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 78.]

**REGISTRATION ACTS (LODGERS)****AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Octavius V. Morgan, Bill to amend the Registration Acts with reference to lodgers entitled to vote at Parliamentary elections, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Octavius V. Morgan, Mr. Beaufoy, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Howell, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Montagu, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Rowlands, and Mr. James Stuart.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 79.]

**TREES (IRELAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Knox, Bill to encourage the planting of Trees in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Knox, Dr. Tanner, Mr. Deasy, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Justin Huntly McCarthy, and Mr. Murphy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 80.]

**MARRIED WOMEN BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Ambrose, Bill to amend the Law by limiting the power of a married woman to bind her husband by contract in certain cases, and to further limit the time for the recovery of small debts and demands, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ambrose and Mr. Bartley.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 81.]

**FISHERIES (IRELAND) (NO. 2) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. William Abraham (Limerick), Bill for the better development of Fisheries in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Abraham (Limerick), Mr. Pinkerton, Mr. Morrogh, Mr. Webb, Mr. McCartan, Mr. Lane, and Mr. O'Keeffe.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 82.]

**RETURN TICKETS.**

On Motion of Mr. Morton, Bill to enable passengers in Railway Trains and on Steamboats, &c., to make use of Return Tickets at any time after the date of issue, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Morton, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Causton, Dr. Clark, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, and Dr. Tanner.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 83.]

**GUARDIANS OF THE POOR (QUALIFICATION) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Henry J. Wilson, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Qualification of Guardians of the Poor, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Henry J. Wilson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Walter M'Laren, and Mr. James Rowlands.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 84.]

VOL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

**SOLICITORS' APPRENTICES (IRELAND)****BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. O'Neill, Bill to amend and consolidate the Laws relating to Solicitors and to the service of Indentured Apprentices in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Keeffe, and Mr. Barton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 85.]

**DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Chance, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Drainage and Improvement of Land in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chance, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Maurice Healy, and Mr. Knox.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 85.]

**NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) (NO. 2) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Henry Campbell, Bill to amend the Law relating to National School Teachers in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Henry Campbell, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Joseph Nolan, and Mr. Conway.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 87.]

**WEEKLY WAGES BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Sexton, Bill to provide for the weekly payment of Wages in certain cases in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin McCarthy, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Flavin, Mr. O'Keeffe, and Mr. Murphy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 88.]

**CHURCHES AND SITES (IRELAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. William Corbet, Bill to provide Sites for Churches, Schools, and Teachers' Residences in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Corbet, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Carew, and Mr. Conway.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 89.]

**CONTEMPT OF COURT (IRELAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Finucane, Bill to amend the Law relating to Contempt of Court in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Finucane, Mr. Knox, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Dillon, Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. Donal Sullivan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 90.]

**PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (NO. 2) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Howell, Bill to consolidate, simplify, and amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Elections; and for other purposes relating thereto, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Howell, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Fenwick, Dr. Hunter, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, and Mr. Warrington.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 91.]

I



**PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING)  
(SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to amend "The Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland) Act, 1887," ordered to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. John Wilson (Govan), Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Leng.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 92.]

**JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (QUALIFICATION)  
BILL.**

On Motion of Sir Joseph Pease, Bill to abolish the property qualification required by persons acting as Justices of the Peace, ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Pease, Sir William Harcourt, Sir Henry James, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Alfred Pease.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 93.]

**LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ALLOTMENTS  
BILL.**

On Motion of Dr. Tanner, Bill to amend the Labourers' (Ireland) Acts for the purpose of providing increased allotments of land for the agricultural labourers in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Tanner, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Knox, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Gilhooly, and Mr. Sheehy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 94.]

**PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Knowles, Bill for the National Registration of Plumbers, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Knowles, Mr. Arthur Acland, Sir Algernon Borthwick, Earl Compton, Mr. William Cross, Mr. Dixon, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, and Mr. Sexton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 95.]

**SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON (SUPER-  
ANNUATION) BILL.**

On Motion of Sir Richard Temple, Bill to enable the School Board for London to grant superannuation allowances to teachers and other employees, ordered to be brought in by Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Gilliat, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Ambrose.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 96.]

**SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (ENG-  
LAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Allison, Bill to enable localities in England to control the sale of Intoxicating Liquors, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Allison, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Burt, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Henry J. Wilson, and Mr. Octavius V. Morgan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 97.]

**PARISH COUNCILS, &c. BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Cobb, Bill for the creation of Parish Councils, to be elected by reformed parish vestries, with powers as to allotments,

charities, outdoor relief of the poor, the management of elementary schools, the housing of the working classes, and other matters, and to amend the Allotments Act, 1887 and 1890, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Francis Stevenson, and Mr. Leon.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 98.]

**POLICE DISABILITIES REMOVAL (EXTEN-  
SION) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Schwann, Bill to extend the provisions of "The Police Disabilities Removal Act, 1887," to municipal and other elections, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Schwann, Mr. Walter M'Laren, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Causton, Mr. Roby, Mr. Mather, Mr. Seale-Hayne, and Mr. Haldane.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 99.]

**TOWN HOLDINGS BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. James Rowlands, Bill to give Compensation to occupying Tenants of town holdings for beneficial improvements, ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Lawson, Mr. David Thomas, and Earl Compton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 100.]

**SHERIFF COURTS CIVIL CODE (SCOTLAND)  
BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Caldwell, Bill to combine in one Code the regulations affecting Sheriff Courts in Scotland, and to extend and amend the Law of Civil Process therein, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Caldwell, Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. Philipps, and Mr. John Wilson (Govan).

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 101.]

**HOSPITALS, &c. (ASSISTANCE FROM  
RATES) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Mather, Bill to enable municipal corporations and other local authorities to give grants in Aid, out of the Rates, if they think fit, to Hospitals and Infirmarys, and such like Charitable Institutions supported by voluntary contributions, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Mather, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Schwann, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Atherley-Jones, and Sir Albert Rollit.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 102.]

**CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY JURISDICTION  
BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Jurisdiction of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and other authorities of the University of Cambridge over persons not members of the University; and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Newnes, Sir Algernon Borthwick, and Mr. Walter M'Laren.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 103.]

**DECK CARGOES BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. James Stevenson, Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts in respect of the carrying of Deck Cargoes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Mr. Fenwick.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 104.]

**COMPANIES ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Sir William Houldsworth, Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1862, ordered to be brought in by Sir William Houldsworth, Mr. Hoyle, Mr. Howell, Mr. Mowbray, and Mr. T. Harrop Sidebottom.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 105.]

**COPYHOLD ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Brand, Bill to amend the Copyhold Acts, and for the enfranchisement of copyhold and customary lands, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Brand, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Halley Stewart, and Mr. John Kelly.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 106.]

**PUBLIC HEALTH (INTERMENTS) ACT (1879) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. J. W. Sidebotham, Bill to make better provision for the regulation and control of Cemeteries provided under "The Public Health (Interments) Act, 1879," ordered to be brought by Mr. J. W. Sidebotham, Mr. John Bright, Mr. William Cross, Mr. Lees, Mr. Mather, and Mr. William Sidebottom.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 107.]

**MAGISTRATES IN POLICE BURGHs (SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Hugh Elliot, Bill to enable the Junior Magistrates of Police Burghs in Scotland to act ex officio as Justices of the Peace and Commissioners of Supply for the County in which the said Burghs are situated, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hugh Elliot, Mr. Mark Stewart, and Mr. Shaw-Stewart.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 108.]

**MERCHANT SEAMEN (PROVISIONS) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. J. Wilson (Durham) Bill to amend the Law relating to Provisions supplied to Seamen, ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Fenwick, Major Rasch, and Mr. Sydney Buxton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 109.]

**CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Henry Bolton, Bill to amend "The Conveyancing and Law of

Property Act, 1881," with reference to Leaseholds, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Henry Bolton, Sir Horace Davey, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Warrington, and Mr. Rantoul.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 110.]

**HARES BILL.**

On Motion of Colonel Dawnay, Bill to enact a "Close Time" for Hares during the breeding season, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Dawnay, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Alfred Pease, Dr. Fitzgerald, and the Marquess of Carmarthen.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 111.]

**SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Macartney, Bill to amend the Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Macartney and Mr. O'Neill.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 112.]

**BEER ADULTERATION BILL.**

On Motion of Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Bill for better securing the purity of Beer, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Baron Dimsdale, Mr. Round, and Mr. Fellowes.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 113.]

**INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES (LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill to give facilities to Industrial and Provident Societies for the purchase of the fee simple of their holdings, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Lawson, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Fraser Mackintosh, Mr. John Kelly, Mr. Octavius V. Morgan, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Channing, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 114.]

**NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (WALES) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Alfred Thomas, Bill to appoint a Secretary of State for Wales, to constitute a Welsh Educational Department, to make further provisions for Local Government, and to create a National Council in Wales, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alfred Thomas, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. Price, Mr. David Randall, Mr. Davies, Mr. Samuel Smith, Sir Edward Reed, Mr. Pritchard Morgan, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy, Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. William Abraham, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. Thomas Ellis, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. John Roberts, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Lloyd Morgan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 115.]

**JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill to amend the Law in regard to the appointment, qualification, and removal of Justices of the Peace, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Bernard Coleridge, Mr. Howell, Mr. Stuart Rendel, Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Cobb, and Mr. George Lambert.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 116.]

**TEACHERS' REGISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION BILL.**

On Motion of Sir Richard Temple, Bill for the registration and organization of Teachers, ordered to be brought in by Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Spencer, and Mr. Sidebotham.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 117.]

**JURYMEN'S EXPENSES (IRELAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Colonel Nolan, Bill for the payment of the expenses of those summoned to serve on juries, and for the abolition of Grand Juries at Quarter Sessions in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Nolan, Dr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Harrison, and Mr. William Corbet.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 118.]

**SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) EXTRACTS BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Caldwell, Bill to simplify the forms of extracts of decrees in the Sheriff Courts of Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Edmund Robertson, and Mr. Mackintosh.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 119.]

**PAROCHIAL BOARDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to reform the constitution of Parochial Boards in Scotland, and the mode of electing the members of such Boards, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Shiress Will, Dr. Farquharson, and Mr. Mackintosh.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 120.]

**CORPORAL PUNISHMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Milvain, Bill to amend the Law relating to corporal punishment, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Milvain, Sir Matthew Ridley, Sir George Russell, and Mr. Wharton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 121.]

**COUNTY COURTS BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Chance, Bill to amend the Law relating to County Courts in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chance and Mr. Murphy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 122.]

**DIVORCE BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Hunter, Bill to amend the Law of Divorce, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hunter, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. Herbert Gardner.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 123.]

**OUTDOOR PROVIDENT RELIEF BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Bartley, Bill to amend the Law relating to Outdoor Relief in sickness and widowhood to the provident poor, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bartley, Mr. Maclean, and Mr. Seager Hunt.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 124.]

**PRIVATE BANKS BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Ernest Spencer, Bill to amend the Law relating to Private Banking Firms, and to make it compulsory that all such firms shall issue an annual balance sheet to their customers, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ernest Spencer, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Maclure, and Mr. Bartley.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 125.]

**PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to amend the Laws relating to the treatment of Prisoners under various Acts in England and Wales; and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Picton, Mr. Atherley-Jones, and Mr. Barran.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 126.]

**ARTIFICIAL MANURES, &c. (ADULTERATION) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill for the better prevention of frauds in the manufacture and sale of Artificial Manures and other preparations for agricultural purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Cobb, Sir Walter Foster, Dr. Farquharson, and Sir John Swinburne.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 127.]

**SOLICITORS' (MAGISTRACY) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Maclure, Bill to enable Solicitors of the High Court of Justice to act as County Magistrates, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Maclure, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Sydney Gedge, and Sir Albert Rollitt.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 128.]

**LOCAL TAXATION (CUSTOMS AND EXCISE) ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Sir Albert Rollitt, Bill to amend "The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890," with respect to contributions for technical instruction, ordered to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollitt, Lord Brooks, Mr. Woodall, and Mr. Roe.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 129.]

House adjourned at a quarter past Four o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 11th February, 1892.*

## SMOKE NUISANCE ABATEMENT (METROPOLIS) BILL. [H.L.]

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: My Lords, I rise to ask your Lordships to read, for the first time, a Bill for the abatement of Smoke in the Metropolis. The subject has often come before the House, and at the present moment it excites considerable interest. The Bill I wish to introduce will approximate, as far as the present state of the law permits, with the form that had previously received the sanction of the Select Committee, who went with anxious care into the details and took important evidence upon it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY): The noble Lord has not given notice, has he?

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: The noble and learned Lord will admit that it is not necessary to give notice.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: For a Bill to be presented for First Reading, but nothing more. If the noble Lord was going to make any observations upon it, he ought to have given notice.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: I am not about to make any further observations, except to express the hope that Her Majesty's Government agree with me that the time for legislation has arrived, and that the time for inquiry has been thoroughly exhausted. It is perfectly usual in this House to make an observation within those narrow limits.

A Bill to amend the Acts for abating the nuisance arising from the smoke of furnaces and fireplaces within the metropolis—Presented by the Lord Stratheden and Campbell; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed. (No. 9.)

## EAST INDIA OFFICERS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Law relating to certain officers in India—Was presented by the Secretary of State for India in Council (the Viscount Cross); read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed. (No. 10.)

## ARMY SERVICE.

## QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

LORD WANTAGE: My Lords, I wish to ask my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War (Earl Brownlow), to whom I have given notice of the question, whether the Report which has been presented to the Secretary of State for War upon the terms and conditions of service in the Army will be laid before this House; and, if so, when?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Earl BROWNLOW): My Lords, up to the present time the Secretary of State has only received the part of the Report signed by the members of the Committee; but he has not received the dissent, which I understand to be signed by one or two members, nor has he received the evidence and the appendices. But it is the intention of the Secretary of State to lay the Report upon the Table in due course.

## POLICE PROTECTION IN IRELAND.

## QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, I beg to ask my noble Friend the Lord Privy Seal the Question that stands in my name, which runs as follows:—To ask Her Majesty's Government whether Mr. John Dillon, Mr. William O'Brien, or Mr. T. Healy have at any time been accorded police protection in Ireland since the prorogation of Parliament in August last; whether any one of these persons is at present accorded police protection when in Ireland; and whether police protection was accorded to any of these persons at their own request?

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl CADOGAN): My Lords, my noble Friend has not elaborated the question of which he has given notice, and I am hardly in a position to answer as to the exact circumstances to which he refers. My noble Friend is quite aware that every subject of Her Majesty has the right to police protection for his person and his property, whensoever such police protection may be found to be necessary. And certainly, with regard to those three persons alluded to by my noble Friend, that right has been con-

ceded to them in the same manner as it would be conceded to all other of Her Majesty's subjects. The final clause of my noble Friend's question refers to a matter of detail, which I am afraid I am unable to answer. My noble Friend has himself been in a position in which he took a large and important share in the maintenance of law and order in Ireland; and I think that at the time when he was Viceroy he would have somewhat deprecated the putting of such a question as that. It is obvious that details of that sort are not such as it would be desirable to discuss in public or within the walls of Parliament, and I trust that to that extent, at all events, my noble Friend will not press me for an answer to his question. I do not understand him to ask with reference to any special dates or times upon the subject to which he has referred; therefore I trust that he will be satisfied with the general answer I have given, that in the case of these three persons named no distinction or difference has been made, but that such police protection has been afforded to them as would be afforded to any one of your Lordships, or any subject of Her Majesty.

\*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERY: My Lords, I am afraid I cannot accept with satisfaction the reply of my noble Friend. I have, as he has mentioned to your Lordships, had a certain amount of experience with regard to the extension of police protection in Ireland. But I would remind him that, in the districts where that police protection is extended, the reasons for which that police protection is invariably extended are generally, and very well known. For instance, my Lords, if there is any member of the lower or humbler classes who has in any way offended the National League of the district by simply taking advantage of those rights which are open to every one of his fellow-citizens, it is well known that his life and his property are in danger, and, consequently, police protection is extended to him. Again, my Lords, if we take the case of a landlord who has come under the ban of the National League, simply because he declines to accept the Plan of Campaign, or any other illegal conspiracy of a similar character, — again, I say, his life is also in con-

*Earl Cadogan*

siderable danger, and again he is placed under police protection. And it is well known why he is placed under police protection. I have myself visited the South of Ireland, and seen some of the inhabitants of that part of the country walking about with policemen behind them; and I should be glad to know from my noble Friend whether that same system of police protection has been extended to the three persons to whom I have alluded, and whether, when they have been in any part of Ireland, either under the troublous circumstances of a general election or at any other time, they have been followed by policemen in the same way as the class of persons to whom I have alluded.

EARL CADOGAN: The question is a somewhat novel one.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERY: I know that it is a somewhat novel question to be put, either to my noble Friend or to any other Member of Her Majesty's Government; but it is simply novel from the fact that the three men to whom I refer have, until a very short time ago, and I believe up to the present moment, before English audiences posed as the idols of the majority of the Irish people. Therefore that is one of the reasons why I wish to know this; because I wish to prove to the English people whether they are the idols they profess to be or not. Then, my Lords, I wish to ask my noble Friend another question. I speak subject to correction on this point, because I have not got the subject up; but I think these three Members of Parliament, about whose protection I am inquiring, were three Members who, in the most violent manner, denounced the Irish Executive for pursuing a policy which they called "shadowing;" but, so far as I can gather from the response of my noble Friend, they are extremely glad to avail themselves of this police shadowing when their own lives are in danger. ["Hear, hear!"] My Lords, I consider this question which I have put to my noble Friend (and I confess I am disappointed that he has not answered me more fully on the subject) is one of extreme import-

ance. I fully understand such of your Lordships as are not connected with Ireland in any practical manner regarding it as of no importance; but I assure them that we Irish Unionists regard this matter as one of very considerable importance. A very short time ago, my Lords, we viewed Members of the Opposition stumping the country up and down, reiterating the parrot-like cry of the union of hearts in the majority of the Irish, which included naturally the National League. My Lords, a more absurd and a more incorrect cry was never raised. I think, my Lords, I am justified in using these epithets with regard to this parrot-like cry, when we consider that at the present moment that majority is divided into at least—I say, advisedly, “at least”—two raging factions, who exercise the resources and ingenuity of their old foes, the Royal Irish Constabulary, in preventing them, whenever the occasion occurs, from breaking each others heads or shedding each others blood. Again, my Lords, when we consider that these three leaders, who proclaimed themselves the popular idols of the country, have been placed (for I maintain that my noble Friend has not denied that they have been) under police protection—at any rate, they have not complained to the Irish Executive that they have been shadowed; and, again, when we see the leader, as I believe he calls himself, of one faction publicly horsewhipped in the Four Courts of Dublin by the nephew of the late leader of the other faction, I think, my Lords, I may say that a more parrot-like and incorrect cry than that of the union of hearts was never raised. I have said, my Lords, that I do not think that those of your Lordships who have no practical experience of Ireland fully realise the importance of this question; but I am glad to say that we, who are practically acquainted with Ireland, do realise it; and we are determined on every occasion that arises to put to the English electorate, fully and fairly, facts such as these that I defy them to contradict or controvert. [“Hear, hear!”] It is absolutely necessary that these facts should be put forward, to let the

English people really understand the condition of the Nationalist Party in Ireland. When once, my Lords, those facts are put forward and thoroughly understood by the English electorate, I am convinced that they will see how utterly absurd, how utterly futile, and how utterly impossible it is that there should be any question whatever of granting any measure of Home Rule to Ireland, which would place the loyal and united minority at the tender mercy of the disloyal and disunited majority. My Lords, with all deference to my noble Friend, I think that his reply to my question is so unsatisfactory that I should be glad to repeat it on a later occasion, or, if it is considered advisable, I have no objection whatever to raise the whole question of this protection on a Motion in any shape that may be convenient to my noble Friend.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I do not protest for a moment against the right of my noble Friend to bring forward the question, or to express his own views on the subject, and I need not say that my own sympathies are not very deeply involved in the three names mentioned in the paper; but this is a matter of information that has come into the hands of the Executive as the Executive, and, if it is to be divulged or used, it must be used impartially. I apprehend that, according to the practice of our Constitution and according to our common reason, it is not competent for the Executive to use information that has come into its hands for the purpose of discrediting those who do not happen to support it, or strengthening those who do support it; and, therefore, if we gave this information, I apprehend that we should be obliged to give information as to all persons who have asked for police protection. I do not think that would be convenient, and therefore, without complaining of the action taken by my noble Friend, I think that the course prescribed by Her Majesty's Government, is different, and that we can hardly give the information for which he asks.

**THE MARQUESS OF LONDON-  
DERBY** *My Lords.* I beg to give notice that I will raise the question, on whatever day is convenient to my noble Friend, in the form of a Motion.

*House adjourned at a quarter  
before Five o'clock.*

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Thursday, 11th February, 1892.*

### STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of Thirteen Members:—Mr. Barclay, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Halsey, Mr. William Lowther, Sir John Mowbray, Colonel Nolan, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Stansfeld, and Mr. Whitbread were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

### SELECTION.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do consist of Ten Members:—Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cubitt, Sir Archibald Orr Ewing, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. Justin McCarthy, Sir Hussey Vivian, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Wodehouse, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

### QUESTIONS.

#### DEATH OF JAMES CHARD ON THE MIDLAND AND SOUTH WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY.

**MR. MUNDELLA** (*Sheffield, Brightside*): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet received the Report of Major Marindin of his inquiry into the circumstances relating to the death of James Chard, guard on the Midland and South Western Junction Railway, on 16th October last; and, if so, whether he will lay it, together with the Correspondence, on the Table of this House?

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD  
OF TRADE** *Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.*: I have received the Report, and am in communication with the Railway Company on the subject. The Papers will be laid on the Table.

#### PLANTING OF LAND IN GALWAY.

**COLONEL NOLAN** (*Galway, N.*): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, how much land has been planted or prepared for planting by the Government in the county of Galway; and, also, how much has been acquired for planting?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR  
IRELAND** *Mr. W. L. Jackson, Leeds, N.*: About 700 acres have been prepared for planting, of which ninety acres will appear on the Estimates for next year. The total area acquired is 900 acres.

#### FOREIGN TARIFFS.

**MR. LENG** (*Dundee*): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in consequence of the important changes recently made in foreign tariffs, he will, for the information of British merchants and manufacturers, cause a Return of the rates of Import Duties now levied in European countries and the United States upon the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to be presented to Parliament, so that it may be published at an early date?

**SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH**: It is proposed to prepare and lay before the House during the present Session a new Return of the rates of Import Duties levied in European countries and the United States of the British produce and manufactures. This will be in continuation of a similar Return issued in October, 1890. As changes in European Tariffs are being made almost day by day it is proposed to delay the publication of this Return until after the middle of the year, in order that it may be substantially correct for some little time after publication, which it would not be if printed at once. Meanwhile, complete statements for separate countries such as France are being prepared, and will shortly be issued.

# FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN THE LONDON CATTLE MARKET.

MR. PICTON (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the following statement in the *Standard* newspaper of the 9th instant:—

"It is said that two cases of foot-and-mouth disease were discovered at the Cattle Market, the animals affected being Norfolk cattle, which had no contact with the Danish oxen, and that the symptoms would tend to show that the disease had developed before the arrival of the Danish cattle last Monday week ;"

whether he is in a position to confirm or to contradict the report in question ; and whether it is true that careful inquiry by the Danish Government has failed to discover any trace of foot-and-mouth disease amongst cattle in Thisted or Esbjerg, from which places the Danish cattle, alleged to be found diseased, were exported to this country ?

SIR EDWARD BIRKBECK (Norfolk, E.): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will, at the same time, answer my question with regard to the fact that an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease took place among cattle at the Metropolitan Meat Market, Caledonian Road, on Thursday, 4th February ; whether he is aware that the cattle in question were part of a cargo of animals embarked in Denmark on 28th January, and landed at Harwich on 30th January ; and whether still greater precautions will be taken in the future to guard against the danger of importing cattle diseases from those foreign Countries from which live animals are imported ?

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) had notice of the following question:—To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can give the House further information as to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the metropolitan cattle markets, and especially as to the statements that there is no foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark, and that the animals affected were from Norfolk, and had not been in contact with Danish cattle ?

MR. JEFFREYS (Hants., Basingstoke) also had notice to ask whether foot-and-mouth disease is very preva-

lent in Germany and other parts of Europe ; whether the disease has been already carried to England by some imported cattle ; and what steps he has taken to prevent the spread of this terrible disease in the United Kingdom ?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (MR. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I will endeavour to reply to all the questions on the Paper on this subject, though I am afraid at more length than is usual in answering a question, by stating all that we know with regard to the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and the steps which we have taken with the object, if possible, of arresting the spread of the disease. On Thursday last, February 4, the Inspector of the Metropolitan Cattle Market, Mr. Rayment, discovered that six animals out of a herd of 11 Danish cattle were suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. The discovery was confirmed by the veterinary officers of the Board, who immediately proceeded to the market, and they at once gave orders for the gates to be closed against the exit of all animals from the market. Upon inquiry it was ascertained that the 11 animals referred to formed part of a cargo of 68 cattle and two sheep which sailed on board the *Fano*, from Esbjerg, in Denmark, on the evening of 27th January. The cargo was landed at Harwich on the 30th, and, after being detained for the usual period, and carefully examined by the Inspector at the port, it reached the Cattle Market on Monday, 1st February. Immediately upon these facts becoming known, orders were issued for the slaughter of all animals then in the market prior to their leaving it. A telegram was sent to all the Local Authorities of the country informing them of what had occurred, and warning them to be on their guard. The Inspectors at the ports were instructed to detain all Danish cattle in their charge, or that might be on their way, as soon as they arrived. The further importation of animals from Denmark was prohibited by order ; and inquiries were set on foot at once, with the view of tracing 59 animals—i.e., 57 cattle and two sheep—belonging to the Danish cargo, which had left the market prior to the



discovery of the disease. These 59 animals, I am happy to say, were all of them traced before the close of the following day to their respective destinations, at Chatham, at Rochester, at Aldershot, at Shorncliffe, at Stratford, and in the Metropolitan District, where the bulk of them had remained; and arrangements were made for the slaughter of all the animals which had not been killed already. On the same day—Friday, the 5th—two English beasts, the animals to which the hon. Member for Leicester refers, were found in the lairs at Islington suffering from the disease. It is correct that they came from Norfolk, but I have caused inquiry to be made at the place from which they came, and that inquiry shows that no trace of disease was found there, and all the stock upon the place in Norfolk were perfectly healthy. So far as we can learn, these animals must have been infected in the lairs. There is no evidence whatever to show that they could have infected the Danish cattle, who were found to be suffering on the previous day, or that the disease had developed in their case before the landing of the Danish cattle in the country. On Saturday, the 6th, information was received that the disease had been discovered in some of the Danish cattle which had been removed to Rochester. These were slaughtered, together with a number of animals with which they had been in contact, which were followed and killed; and on the same day an Order was passed prohibiting the entire movement of animals from the Metropolitan District, and from all the other places to which the Danish cattle had been sent. On Tuesday last I regret to say that further outbreaks of the disease were reported from Clapton, Bromley-by-Bow, and from Welling, near Dartford, in Kent, all of them being places within the Metropolitan District, and to which cattle from the Metropolitan Market had been sent. In all these cases, Inspectors have been immediately sent down, the animals slaughtered, and the places disinfected. Another case was reported to us this morning from Bethnal Green. There were five cattle in the shed, and the disease, as in the other cases, had been introduced from the market on the 1st of

*Mr. Chaplin*

February. The same procedure has been adopted with regard to these animals to-day. In addition to these measures, the holding of all markets in the Metropolitan area has been temporarily prohibited. Instructions have been issued to all the local authorities in the Metropolitan district as to the steps to be taken on the discovery of the disease. Inspectors have been appointed to visit and watch the Metropolitan dairies; and while I cannot conceal from the House that, in my opinion, the danger of its spreading to the country is extreme, I am not without some hope that the disease may still be prevented from escaping beyond the Metropolitan area. In further reply to the Member for Leicester, I may say that the Danish Minister was good enough to send me a telegram from his Government on the 5th, from which it appeared that, up till then, they had failed to discover the existence of the disease in Denmark. But I have had no further information, official or otherwise, since then. We know, however, that it has quite recently spread from Germany, where it is very prevalent, to Schleswig-Holstein; and I am advised that it is quite possible that the disease may have been conveyed by traders from Hamburg or Altona to the cargo which left Esbjerg on the 27th, before they were embarked. Lastly, in answer to my hon. Friend the Member for East Norfolk—and I apologise to the House for the length of this reply—as to whether still greater precautions will be taken in future, I may add that the importation of animals from the Netherlands has been suspended as well as from Denmark. The only European countries from which animals are now admitted are Norway, Sweden, Spain, and Portugal, and I do not know of any greater precautions which it would be possible to take, short of prohibiting all importation from these countries also.

MR. PICTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman say, were the cattle slaughtered at Rochester part of the Danish cargo?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes.

MR. PICTON: Was the disease traced in any other of the 59 animals?

MR. CHAPLIN: So far as I know the disease was found in two of the animals traced to Rochester, and which formed part of the Danish cargo.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say, have any precautions been taken by the disinfection of drovers bringing cattle from Ireland, so that they may not introduce the disease into Ireland on their return?

MR. CHAPLIN: I took the earliest opportunity of informing the Irish Government of what had occurred, and I have no doubt that every precaution is being taken to prevent the importation of the disease from England into Ireland.

SIR E. BIRKBECK: Perhaps my right hon. Friend can say, have definite instructions been issued to Her Majesty's Consuls abroad that they shall keep careful watch for any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and report to the Government at home when any case becomes known to them?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes; such instructions have been repeatedly given, and, so far as I know, they are carefully carried out.

#### OPIUM TRADE IN BOMBAY.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement in a pamphlet just issued, entitled *The Poppy Plague in India*, that the consumption of opium in the Bombay Presidency has increased 549 per cent. since 1877, and, in the City of Bombay, 2,161 per cent.; whether these figures are correct; whether it is a fact that all shops for the sale of opium are closed,

"on or adjacent to the line of march whilst a regiment or detachment of soldiers is passing, or is encamped in the vicinity;"

and whether the Government of India will be invited to extend the same protection to the natives of the country which they do to British soldiers?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (MR. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The Secretary of State has seen these figures quoted, but he cannot identify them.

At pages 73 and 89 of the Opium Papers just published will be found a detailed account of the consumption of duty-paid opium in Bombay city and Presidency from 1879 to 1889. It will be seen from page 9 of the same Return that the increase in the sale of duty-paid opium is explained by the Government of India as being entirely due to the substitution of duty-paid for contraband opium, and that the retail price of opium has been more than doubled in the last 14 years. In answer to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Question, I have to say the Secretary of State is not aware that all opium shops are closed when troops are marching or encamped in the neighbourhood.

#### THE LAND PURCHASE ACT, 1885.

MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a purchaser under the Land Purchase Act of 1885, having obtained an advance of £725, and having paid four half-yearly instalments of £14 10s. each for interest and principal, was informed that he could not redeem the remaining instalments for less than £726; whether it is a fact that the Schedule to the Act, fixing the prices for redeeming annuities, has been entirely miscalculated, and is in error throughout; and whether he will introduce a Bill amending the Act, and providing that annuities should be redeemed at prices correctly calculated, or in accordance with Tables to be published by the Treasury, as under the Act of 1891?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square) answered the Question as follows:—My attention has been called to the circumstances mentioned by the hon. Member in his Question, and Her Majesty's Government are considering the question of introducing a clause to meet the objections to the present Table.

#### ANNUITIES UNDER THE PURCHASE OF LAND AND CONGESTED DISTRICTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1891.

MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whe-

ther the Tables providing for the redemption of annuities under "the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Act, 1891," have yet been published; and, if not, when they will probably be published?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): No; these Tables are not published; they are dependent on the rules to be made by the Treasury under the Purchase of Land, &c. (Ireland) Act, 1891, and the Tables will I hope shortly follow when the rules are complete.

#### LOUGH ERNE DRAINAGE WORKS.

MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the Return ordered relating to the Lough Erne Drainage Works will be presented to the House?

SIR JOHN GORST: The Board of Public Works have prepared the Report in question, and it will be ready for presentation in the course of a few days.

#### H.M.S. "VICTORIA."

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can furnish the House with any information regarding the cause of the stranding of the iron-clad *Victoria* on the 30th January upon a spit of rock called "Snipe Island," near Dragomesti, in the Gulf of Patras; whether the rock in question is marked upon the chart issued by the Admiralty, and if at the time of grounding the captain was using every precaution, with the lead forward or only amidships; whether the Admiral in charge of the Mediterranean Squadron is responsible for the waters in which his ships are exercised, or that officers commanding (whether deep or light draught of water vessels) are, when engaged in torpedo practice, compelled (as stated in the *Times* of the 8th February) to carry out the manœuvres in 10 fathoms of water, thereby, in rocky waters, endangering the safety of the ships; and can he state whether the damage can be repaired at Malta; if not, is it intended to send the vessel to one of the naval dockyards of France or Italy in place of risking the long voyage home; or, if brought to England, is it intended to re-ship the stores

Mr. Knox

removed to lighten the vessel, or send them by another vessel?

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): As the circumstances connected with this accident will form the subject of a court-martial, it is not advisable at present for me to do more than give a mere outline of the facts, so far as they have been reported to the Admiralty, and therefore I must respectfully decline at present to answer any question implying carelessness or conveying censure on those concerned in the accident. The *Victoria* went aground just off Snipe Point, near Dragomesti. There is a shoal off Snipe Point, which was discovered last year, and the existence of which was made known in the usual way by hydrographic notice. It is not marked in the chart. No rules as to the precise depth of water in which torpedoes are to be run have been laid down, and therefore ships are not compelled to run unnecessary risks in carrying out the required practice. The *Victoria* will shortly be docked at Malta, when the damage will be fully ascertained, and the necessary steps taken for her repair. At present the damage is reported not to be serious.

#### THE STRANRAER MAILS.

MR. LEA (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if his attention has been called to the frequent late arrivals of the mail train at Stranraer, and the consequent delay in the arrival of mails at Belfast and Londonderry; whether any representations upon the matter have been made to the London and North-Western Railway Company, and if there is a prospect of a more punctual service; and if the other portion of the new mail service has been worked with regularity?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): There has been some irregularity, and, in several cases, apparently from avoidable causes, to which the attention of the railway companies concerned has been invited. It is right to say that the trains on the British side are timed at a rate of speed which affords little margin for contingencies. As regards the oversea and Irish railway services, they have not been al-

together free from irregularity, but there has been little cause for complaint.

#### THE SAVINGS BANKS ACT, 1891.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer who have been appointed members of the Committee of Inspection under Section 2 of "The Savings Banks Act, 1891-2?"

MR. GOSCHEN: The members of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks are: Sir Albert K. Rolit, M.P.; Mr. H. G. Bowen, Chief Accountant of the Bank of England; Mr. T. A. Welton, President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants; Mr. W. M. Walters, President of the Incorporated Law Society; Mr. J. M. Ludlow, late Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies; Mr. John Ure, Lord Dean of Guild, Glasgow; Mr. T. H. Newman, of New Broad Street, City.

MR. J. ELLIS: Will these names be printed and laid before us?

MR. GOSCHEN: I will consider the suggestion. Great pains have been taken in the selection, and I trust the selection will satisfy the House generally.

#### COUNTY ALDERMEN.

MR. MAC INNES (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether County Aldermen who retire by rotation at the approaching County Council Elections can be elected as Councillors at the same elections?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. LONG, Wilts, Devizes): In the absence of my right hon. Friend, the hon. Member will allow me to reply. It would appear that a retiring County Alderman is not legally disqualified for election as a County Councillor. In connection with this question, the decision of the Courts in "*Regina v. the Mayor of Bangor*" with regard to a similar question under the Municipal Corporations Act may be referred to.

#### THE INFLUENZA EPIDEMIC.

COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if he now proposes to utilize in

any way the scientific and financial resources of the State to endeavour to discover the origin and best means of effectually checking the fatal epidemic of influenza, now in its third year of visitation?

MR. LONG: The Local Government Board having been of opinion that further investigation ought to be instituted with reference to influenza, with a view to the discovery of its origin and the best means of effectually checking its fatal prevalence, an inquiry has already been commenced and is being conducted by the Medical Department of the Board with the assistance of pathological and other experts.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board whether any decision has been arrived at with reference to holding a special official inquiry as to the repeated outbreaks of influenza; and, if so, under whose direction the inquiry will be held, what will be its scope, and when will it commence; whether the inquiry which was held by the Medical Department of the Board in 1890, or any subsequent investigations, have rendered it practicable for the Board to draw up and issue to the various Sanitary Authorities for publication in newspapers and in conspicuous places in every town and district, concise and simple directions as to precautionary measures to be taken in a practical and shorter form than those recently issued; and whether any notification has been or will be sent to the Sanitary Authorities that the sanction of the Board will upon application be given to providing a temporary supply of medicine, either with a view to prevention or cure, and medical assistance to the poorer inhabitants under "The Public Health Act, 1875" and "The Public Health (London) Act, 1891?"

MR. LONG: My reply to the previous question deals with the first point referred to. As regards the second point, the question has been considered, but it does not appear to the Local Government Board that they can with advantage issue further directions or suggestions as to precautionary measures for general publication by Sanitary Authorities. In no case have the

Board received any application by a Sanitary Authority that they should be authorised to provide, in connection with an outbreak of influenza, a temporary supply of medicine and medical assistance for the poorer inhabitants of their district under the Public Health Acts. It may, therefore, be inferred that the Sanitary Authorities have not regarded the circumstances as requiring that any such arrangements should be adopted, and the Board have no information which would lead them to a different conclusion. They would, however, consider any application where, from exceptional circumstances, such a course appeared desirable.

MR. COBB: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that some two years ago the President of the Local Government Board gave precisely the same answer in reference to an inquiry as that we have just heard. Have there been no results from that inquiry?

MR. LONG: There have been results, but nothing I think that at present it is desirable to communicate to Local Authorities. If anything result from the present inquiry, and the Board see their way to offer any assistance to Local Authorities, that assistance shall be at once given to the best of their ability.

#### THE ROYAL NAVAL ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS.

MR. NOBLE (Hastings): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what steps have been taken for the disposal of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteer Corps, and whether any satisfactory compensation has been granted to them?

\*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: We have been in communication with the War Office as to the transfer of corps of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, but there is great difficulty in retaining these Volunteers as a separate and distinct organisation in connection with the military defences of the country, and this idea must, therefore, be abandoned. The Committee which was referred to in the Admiralty letter of 13th November last will, accordingly, at once proceed to examine into the financial position of the corps, with the view of ascertaining the amount and nature of compensation that should be

granted. I hope, however, that the individual members of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers will offer their services to the various corps of Submarine Mining Volunteers, which already exist under the War Office, and will continue in this new sphere to devote the same zeal and energy to the service of their country as they have previously shown when in direct connection with the Navy.

#### THE CARDIFF SAVINGS BANK.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can inform the House what progress has been made in winding up the affairs of the Cardiff Savings Bank; whether the contributories have paid in their several amounts; and, if so, what sums have been so paid; whether any, and if so who, have refused to pay; and what steps are being taken to compel payment; and whether it is the intention of the liquidator to pay any dividend to the depositors; if so, what amount, and when to be paid?

MR. GOSCHEN: I have obtained the following information from the official liquidator:—Proceedings have been instituted against 33 trustees and managers. One case (against the president) has been argued, and judgment is reserved. A sum of £7,000 in all has, with the sanction of the Court, been accepted from seven of the trustees and managers in settlement of the claims against them. It is anticipated that some further settlements may shortly be approved. Until the proceedings are further advanced, or unless settlements are made, it is impossible to make any statement as to the prospects of a dividend. The Government have no responsibility for, or control over, the management of the liquidation. It is in the hands of the Court, under whose direction the liquidator acts; and I would suggest to the hon. Member that he may obtain any further information which he may desire from the official liquidator.

MR. HOWELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these winding-up proceedings have been now going on for five years?

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes; I am aware of that. It is a most unfortunate affair.

*Mr. Long*

I hear proceedings have been continued for many years; I wish it were in the power of the Government to accelerate the proceedings, but they are in the hands of the Court. Of course, proceedings being taken against 33 persons must involve considerable expenditure of time.

MR. HOWELL: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can inform the House as to the total cost, legal and otherwise, in connection with the winding up of the Cardiff Savings Bank, and by whom those costs are being borne; and whether he will consent to lay upon the Table of this House a Return as to such costs, under each head respectively?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am informed that the taxed costs and the remuneration to the liquidator up to February 9, 1891, amount to £5,976, the legal costs being £3,476, and the remuneration of the liquidator £2,500. This amount is fixed by the Court; we have no power over it.

MR. HOWELL: Will the costs come out of the money recovered?

MR. GOSCHEN: Out of the assets of the bank.

#### BOARD OF TRADE REPORT ON TRADE UNIONS.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Report of the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade on Trade Unions for the year 1889 or 1890 has not yet been issued; whether he can inform the House when the Report will appear; and whether it is the intention of the Board of Trade to delay such Report until that for 1891 is completed?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: This Report was sent to the printers on Saturday last, and I understand it is to be published next week.

#### FOGS AND DEATHS FROM DROWNING IN THE DOCKS IN LONDON.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has caused inquiries to be made as to the number of deaths by drowning in the docks in London

during the recent fogs; and whether he has been able to advise the Dock Companies to adopt any system of protection against such accidents in the future; and whether he proposes to order a public inquiry into the question?

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) had notice of the following Question: To ask the President of the Board of Trade how many cases of death occurred during the late fogs in the various docks of the City of London; and whether he has power to compel the various Dock Companies to place posts and chains some six feet from edge of quays?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I have received 18 returns of coroners' inquests into the deaths of persons drowned in the London docks between October 1, 1890, and the 7th January last. I cannot say, however, whether any further deaths have since taken place. Of course, hon. Members are aware that the Board of Trade have no statutory powers of ordering a public inquiry or of compelling the Dock Companies to take any particular action in regard to this matter; but I have been in communication with the Dock Companies, and at their desire have directed an officer of the Board to confer with representatives of the companies, with a view to seeing what precautions can be taken for the protection of the public in future.

MR. HERBERT GARDNER (Essex, Saffron Walden): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, considering the increase in the number and intensity of fogs in the Metropolis and the loss of life, accidents, and difficulties to traffic arising therefrom, it is his intention to cause any inquiry to be made as to means for preventing fogs in London?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: No, Sir. I am thankful to say the duties of the Board of Trade do not extend to the prevention of fogs in London.

#### IRISH EDUCATION RETURN.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when he intends to lay upon the Table of the House the Return on Irish Education promised at the close of last Session?

MR. JACKSON: My hon. Friend will have seen, perhaps, that the Return was laid on the Table yesterday.

#### THE GLENTIES RAILWAY.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware of the fact that since last October only eight men have been employed daily on that portion of the new Railway for 12 miles from the town of Glenties, and that the men employed on the smaller portion are only receiving 2½d. per hour for the fair hours of the day, while it is well-known to some people that the winter was a severe and wet one; and whether he would consider it advisable to notify the contractors that the men who have been thrown out of employment should be taken on again, and the works proceeded with without delay?

MR. JACKSON: I have no information of the nature mentioned in the Question. Contracts were made under the authority of the Treasury, and the contractors, I believe, are bound under penalty to complete the works within a given time.

MR. O'HANLON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the facts in the district, and are the Government prepared to undertake a scheme for the reclamation of the land by which thousands of acres might be made available, giving employment to labour with no liability for heavy unremunerative expenditure?

MR. JACKSON: I am afraid I must have more detailed information before I can answer that question.

#### PAYMENT TO JURORS IN IRELAND.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a Report from the Cavan Board of Guardians as to a resolution passed recommending the payment of jurors attending assizes and quarter sessions, and if he has also received a similar one passed by the Derry Guardians; and, if so, is the Government prepared to bring in a Bill to amend the jury system generally?

MR. JACKSON: I am informed that no such resolutions as those referred to have been received by the Irish Government.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON DESIGNS FOR THE NEW COINAGE.

MR. ERNEST SPENCER (West Bromwich): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Committee, which was appointed in order to assist the authorities of the Mint with their advice both as regards the design and the general character of coins, have yet reported to him as to the various designs which have been submitted to them, and especially whether they have reported in favour of all silver coins having their value inscribed thereon?

MR. GOSCHEN: Various designs have been submitted to the Committee, and I understand that the final meetings of the Committee are now being held. They have made their choice, though they have still several points of detail to consider. They hope to make their Report in a short time.

#### BETTING AND GAMBLING LAWS.

MR. MORTON (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he intends to introduce this Session the Bill for the consolidation and amendment of the laws relating to betting and gambling, referred to by him in the debate of last Session?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): It is still too soon in the Session for me to make any definite announcement on this subject, or to add another controversial measure to the list of Government Bills. An amending Bill would take up a good deal of the time of the House.

#### WORMWOOD SCRUBS PRISON.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what steps he has taken to investigate the causes of the outbreak at Wormwood Scrubs Prison on the 19th December last; and whether it is true, as stated in the *Standard* newspaper, that

"large numbers of old and hardened criminals were placed in charge of young and inexperienced warders," and that

"the ventilators in the cells of the prison were so imperfectly devised that they served the purpose of speaking-tubes between one prisoner and another."

**MR. MATTHEWS:** The circumstances of the disorder at Wormwood Scrubs were duly investigated by the Prison Commissioners and reported to me. In the formation of a new staff, consequent on the conversion of Wormwood Scrubs into a local prison, a certain proportion of new officers were appointed, but I am informed that the disorder, which was quickly checked, was not due to this cause. There has been no repetition of the occurrences of the 19th December. The ventilators at Wormwood Scrubs are of the same construction as at other prisons, and are not imperfectly devised. The prisoners cannot communicate with one another through the ventilators except by shouting, and this is at once heard by the officials and repressed.

#### MESSRS. WATERLOW'S CONTRACT.

**MR. PICKERSGILL:** I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether Government has renewed, or is about to renew, a contract with Messrs. Waterlow; and, if so, what is the nature, and what is the duration, of the contract; and what steps have been, or will be, taken to secure (in compliance with the engagement given by the Government last Session)

"the payment of the rate of wages generally accepted as current for a competent workman in his trade."

**SIR JOHN GORST:** Messrs. Waterlow and Sons hold two contracts with the Stationery Office for vellum binding. These contracts were, on the 31st of October last, provisionally extended for two years from the 31st March, 1892. The proviso attached to the extension was that the contracts might be terminated on or after the 31st of March, 1893, on six months' notice given by either side. The Controller of the Stationery Office has been instructed to send to all contractors a circular similar to that now being issued by the Admiralty, War Office, and other Departments of Government.

#### THE PRISON COMMISSIONERS.

**MR. PICKERSGILL:** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home

Department whether Mr. Ruggles Brise has been appointed to the Prison Commissionership vacated by Admiral Hornby; and, whether Colonel Garsia has been appointed Secretary to the Prison Commissioners?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** Both these appointments have been made.

#### THE POSTMASTER AT ABERDEEN.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the postmaster at Aberdeen has been retired with full pension; whether the Town Council of Aberdeen, the Chamber of Commerce, and other public bodies interested, have made representations to the Treasury that the postmaster is able and willing to discharge with efficiency all the duties of the office; whether, at the time the postmaster at Aberdeen and other public servants were appointed, there was no Minute of the Treasury requiring retirement so long as such servants were fit to perform their duties; whether the retirement referred to will involve an additional cost to the Treasury of £433 6s. 8d.; and, in all the circumstances, whether, in terms of the Treasury Minute, he may consent to an extension in this case of a further period of five years?

**\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): An Order in Council, founded on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Civil Establishments, prescribes retirement at the age of 65, unless, in a particular case such retirement would be detrimental to the public interest. The postmaster at Aberdeen has accordingly been retired on the pension earned by his long and good service. Representations have, I believe, been received from Aberdeen in favour of this officer's continued employment, but the Government are bound to carry out the policy laid down in the Order in Council—an instrument ranking next in authority to an Act of Parliament, and I cannot say that this officer's retirement is detrimental to the public interest, although he was in all respects an efficient public servant. It has always been the rule that officers could elect to retire or could be retired on pension after 60 years of age. I cannot



admit that, in order to save the amount of the pension, there is economy in retaining civil servants beyond the age deliberately fixed by a Royal Commission as that at which, in the interest of the efficiency of the public service, they ought to retire.

#### THE "EQUIVALENT GRANT" TO SCOTLAND.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when Her Majesty's Government intend to state to the House their proposals with reference to the money payable to Scotland under the head of the so-called "Equivalent Grant," and whether those proposals are intended to be made in the form of a Bill; or, if not, in what other form?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): My right hon. Friend has requested me to reply to this question. The Government are decidedly of opinion that the best way to proceed in this matter is by Bills and not by Resolutions, and they propose at the very earliest day to lay their provisions before the House. If the exigencies of public business or otherwise should render it impossible to carry through the Bills, they might reluctantly proceed by Resolution, but they would do so with great regret.

MR. BRYCE: Am I to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that he means by the expression "the very earliest day" within the next fortnight?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bills will be printed and circulated immediately after the Queen's Speech has been disposed of.

#### EDUCATION IN DOCKYARD TOWNS.

MR. HERBERT KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the serious loss which is occasioned to the Board and Voluntary Schools at Sheerness and other dockyard towns owing to the recent decision of the Education Department that no fee grant is to be paid in respect of any child who has passed the seventh standard; whether he is aware that it is necessary in dock-

yard towns to retain the elder children at school for the purpose of fitting them for apprenticeship to the various trades, these children being those of working men who can ill-afford to keep them so long at school after passing the exemption standard; and whether it was the intention of the Committee in Council at the passing of the Act that such children should be excluded from its provisions, seeing that section 1 only refers to an age and not to a proficiency limit?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (SIR WILLIAM H. DYKE, Kent, Dartford): If my hon. Friend will refer to the report of the discussion in Committee upon this section of the Act on June 30th, 1891, he will be able to satisfy himself that the case only of children in average attendance at Elementary Schools was under consideration. The Department must therefore, I fear, be bound by the strict terms of the Act, which restrict the payment of the fee grant to children in average attendance at Elementary Schools.

#### IRISH PAWNBROKERS.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if it is his intention this Session to introduce a Bill to amend the Law relating to pawnbrokers in Ireland; whether the extension of the English system to Ireland is contemplated; and whether there is a clause in the English Act preventing pawnbrokers taking pledges from drunkards?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. MADDEN, Dublin University): The matter referred to in the Question of the hon. Member is one which is very difficult to deal with, and one upon which nothing like unanimity prevails amongst the several interests concerned, and the Government are not prepared to deal with the matter at present.

MR. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he would be willing to receive a deputation of traders and residents in Belfast and the North of Ireland, who desire to have an opportunity of laying their views before the Government?

MR. MADDEN: I have given considerable attention to this question for the last two years. I have recently

*Sir James Fergusson*

been made aware of the views entertained by the traders of Belfast and the North of Ireland; but, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be exceedingly obliged to any persons who bring their views before me.

#### THE PADDY TAX IN CEYLON.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Her Majesty's Government has come to any decision as to the abolition of the Paddy Tax in Ceylon; if so, have instructions been sent to the Government of that Colony to introduce legislation to carry that resolution into effect; and by what taxation is the revenue supplied by the Paddy Tax to be replaced?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron H. DE WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): If the hon. Member will postpone his Question for a short time I trust I may then be in a position to make a definite statement on the subject.

#### DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT IN IRELAND.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether the provisions of "The Deeds of Arrangement Amendment Act, 1890," so far as relates to private arrangements, and especially Sub-section 5 of Section 2, have been disregarded; and what steps the Government proposes to take to compel the observance of the Act?

MR. MADDEN: I have no official information before me at present on this subject. If the hon. Member will kindly repeat his Question, I shall endeavour to obtain the information he desires.

#### MR. FORMAN'S MISSION.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is in a position to state the result of the Mission of Mr. Forman to the Continent; whether this officer was successful in getting a reduction in the transit rates charged by France and Italy for the conveyance of the Indian and Australian mails between Calais and Brindisi; and whether he is in a position to

inform the House of the result of his inquiries regarding the feasibility of sending our Eastern mails *via* Salonica?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I have been in communication with the French and Italian Post Offices on the subject of the hon. Member's Question. There will be in future a reduction of about £7,300 a year upon the charge for the conveyance of the Eastern mails by special accelerated trains. Books and newspapers will be carried at the territorial transit rates of the Postal Union. As regards the Salonica route, it is undoubtedly feasible, and it might afford a certain acceleration, but it is not proposed at present to resort to it.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: Has the right hon. Gentleman any objection to lay the Papers on the Table of the House?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I will consider that.

#### COUNTY COURTS IN IRELAND.

MR. CHANCE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Government intend to take any steps to secure the efficient administration of the law by County Courts in Ireland, in accordance with the views put forward by the Associated Chambers of Commerce?

MR. MADDEN: The subject is under the consideration of the Government, and I hope to be able to embody the views put forward by the Associated Chambers of Commerce in a Bill which I intend to introduce on an early day.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What day?

MR. MADDEN: As soon as possible.

#### OLD AGE PENSIONS.

COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, having regard to the statements laid before the country of the extent of old age pauperism among the industrial classes, the Government will assent to the early appointment of a Select Committee to ascertain the facts, and the best means of remedying the evil, and enabling the thrifty to secure State guaranteed pensions in old age upon easy terms, through Friendly Societies or otherwise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This matter has excited, and I think rightly excited,

very great interest in the country ; but since I saw the hon. Member's question on the Notice Paper this morning I have had very little time to consider it myself, and have had no time to consult my colleagues on the matter. The hon. Member, however, will bear in mind that a large part, if not the whole, of this question, has already been very thoroughly examined into by a Committee who sat during the three years from 1885 to 1888. They took a large batch of evidence on this subject, and laid a very important Report before the House. Whether there is anything that can be usefully added to that Report I have some doubt.

#### THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

MR. THOMAS SEXTON: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware of the fact that the usual monthly Returns of the proceedings of the Irish Land Commission have not been put in the hands of hon. Members since July last year, a month preceding the passage of the Land Purchase Act; so that we are entirely in the dark upon the proceedings that have taken place under the Land Purchase Act. I wish to ask if he can state to the House the number of applications that have been made under the Act, the number of the tenants concerned, and the number of applications that have been sanctioned, say, up to the end of the year?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman when the annual Report of the Land Commission will be issued?

MR. JACKSON: I am not able to answer the question of the hon. Member for West Belfast. If he will furnish me with the particulars he wishes to have specified, I shall endeavour to have an answer. In reply to the hon. Member for South Tyrone, I will inquire about the annual Report of the Land Commission.

#### CAULKERS IN ROYAL DOCKYARDS.

MR. H. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN (Kent, Faversham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will explain why the caulkers employed in Her Majesty's Dockyards, who perform the same duties and have hitherto been on an equality and received the same

wages as shipwrights, under the recent new scheme of wages receive one shilling per week less than shipwrights?

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. FORWOOD, Lancashire, Ormskirk): In determining the rates of pay, the claims of the caulkers were carefully considered. Their trade, however, is more limited in scope and of less importance than formerly, compared with that of the shipwrights; and when advancing the scale of pay for each of these classes, it was considered desirable to mark by a slight variation the difference in the character of their respective work.

#### MR. DE COBAIN.

(4.15.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to make the Motion which stands in my name, and in doing so I do not think it necessary for me to inform the House that on the 14th of July last a Resolution was adopted requiring Mr. De Cobain to attend in his place in the House in the succeeding week, that during the course of that week he sent a letter to you, Sir, explaining fully to the House his inability to come over to the House, and in consideration of this the order was withdrawn and the matter was allowed, for the moment, to rest. I think the House will probably feel that I have no alternative now but to renew the Resolution and ask the House—

"To require Mr. Edward S. W. De Cobain to attend this House in his place upon Tuesday the 23rd of February."

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain do attend this House in his place upon Tuesday the 23rd of February."—(Mr. Arthur Balfour).

(4.18.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I should like to ask a question of the First Lord in relation to this Motion. I think it is a Motion which he was bound to make, and therefore for my part I do not intend to quarrel with it; I think this House acted very indulgently towards the hon. Gentleman in its proceedings of last Session, and I think the House at that time was under an obligation to you, Mr. Speaker, for the way in which you prevented it from taking any precipitate action in the matter. But it appears to me that the Motion is extremely curious in its character, because when it says that Mr. De Cobain is required to

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

attend in his place on Tuesday the 23rd of February, everybody knows that the moment Mr. De Cobain landed on this shore in pursuance of the order of this House, he would be at once met by a detective at Dover and forthwith arrested. And what appears to me is that an appendage should be added to the motion, to the following effect :—

**"And that this House will treat the attempt of any person, whomsoever, to prevent the said Member from complying with its orders as a contempt of this House."**

I think that this is the inevitable logic of the situation. It seems to me that the true course for the Government to take is this, either to withdraw the present motion and treat the past action of Mr. De Cobain in not presenting himself for trial as a contempt of this House, or else, if the Government are going to invite him here, that at least you should make it clear that his path should not be barred by the police in the interval. This House has no business to pass blind orders that cannot be obeyed, but orders that can be given effect to, and until the right hon. Gentleman has made up his mind, I move that, in addition to the resolution, the following words should be added :—

**"And that this House will treat the attempt of any person whomsoever to prevent the said Member from complying with its order as a contempt of this House."**

Let me say that the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Belfast circulated amongst the Members of this House a document which I suppose none of us have had time, even if we had the wish, to study, but no doubt there is a strong impression among representatives of the democratic Orange Party in Ulster that a considerable pressure has been applied to him, because he represented more or less the working-class interest.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to contradict that.

MR. T. M. HEALY: That may be contrary to the fact. I give no opinion on it whatever, and I assure the hon. Gentleman, the Member for South Belfast, that I am not dealing with the subject as one settled in my mind. I only state that an impression prevails that while other gentlemen, including a noble lord, were assisted, as we know

from a declaration of the hon. Member for Northampton, and enabled to quit the country, Mr. De Cobain has been singled out because he represents the democratic Orange party, and they are opposed in that impression by gentlemen from Ulster who represent the more aristocratic Orange party. Personally I myself think Mr. De Cobain placed himself entirely in the wrong by not coming over and standing his trial, and this House, so far as my judgment is concerned, and no Member of this House, is now called upon to seek further for any special treatment in regard to him.

Amendment proposed,

**At the end of the Question, to add the words "and that this House will treat the attempt of any person whomsoever to prevent the said Member from complying with its order as a contempt of this House."—(Mr. T. M. Healy.)**

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

(4.22.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I think the course which the Government has taken is the only course they could have pursued, and that it is the right course to pursue. I cannot agree with what my hon. and learned Friend the Member for North Longford has just said. The truth is that the proceedings of this House are against a Member who is a notorious fugitive from justice, and continuously a fugitive from justice. Last year reasons were alleged why he should have time, and that he was involuntarily a fugitive from justice. Nobody can believe that now. The pertinacious and determined absence of the hon. Member from this House shows that he is determined not to meet a Court of Justice. For months he has been capable of proving his innocence of all the allegations made against him there if he came to England. Now it concerns the honour of this House that he should not be a member of it who is continually a fugitive from justice. It is therefore right to order Mr. De Cobain to return here. We say to him here: "either come and clear your character or cease to be a Member of this House." That is the plain meaning of these proceedings. We have nothing to do with a Court of Justice or the arrest of

Mr. De Cobain. I venture to think that my hon. and learned Friend's Amendment is not Constitutional. The House cannot order a warrant not to be executed. Such an assumption on the part of the House would be a breach of the principle on which a free Constitution rests. The execution of justice is independent of the Crown, or either House of Parliament. For one House of Parliament by Resolution to order the course of justice to be intercepted, is a thing we could not countenance at all—therefore it seems to me our proceedings are perfectly clear. We say now that there can be no doubt whatever that Mr. De Cobain is a fugitive from justice, and he must either return and meet the accusations against him in a court of law, or cease to be a Member of this House. If he come back and, before a court of law, prove to be innocent, we shall receive him with gladness and satisfaction. If he persist, under the grave accusations against him, in absenting himself from a fair trial and the means of vindicating his character, then this House must declare that he ceases to be a Member of it, in consideration of its own dignity and honour. Therefore I cannot support the amendment of my hon. and learned Friend.

MR. THOMAS SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I think the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for North Longford may, perhaps, be technically open to the objection pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. No doubt, however, it is the intention of the House and the Government that Mr. De Cobain should return to this country and have an opportunity of obeying the Order of the House, and I think the difficulty might be met by an undertaking on the part of the Government that when Mr. De Cobain returned to the country he should be allowed to obey the Order of the House without any action—[“No, no”]. Why not? Surely if an Order of the House is issued it is intended to be obeyed. The ends of justice would not be thwarted, because after he had obeyed the Order he could as easily be arrested as before; and therefore I think the Government should give an undertaking that Mr. De Cobain should be allowed to obey

*Sir William Harcourt*

the Order of the House before being arrested.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman will feel that his argument has been answered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. If we were to give any engagement about the arrest of Mr. De Cobain we should, in the first place, be doing that which we have no power to do; and if we did a Court of Law would disregard it. Even if we could, we should, by such proceedings, obviously be interfering with the Courts of Justice. The case could not, I think, be more lucidly or concisely put than as it has been put by the right hon. Gentleman. Mr. De Cobain is still a Member of Parliament, though a Member of Parliament with a warrant out against him. He refuses to come home and clear himself, and let the matter be decided according to the evidence on the trial, on one side or the other. It would not be consistent with honour for the House to allow one of its Members to remain in this position. We require him to come back, and no doubt if he did come back he would be obliged to do that which he ought to have done long ago—namely, to submit himself to the proper tribunal of the country. If the House were to attempt to do what the hon. Gentleman has suggested, it would be an attempt to do that which is in itself unconstitutional, and which I believe there is no legal power to do.

MR. CHARLES J. DARLING (Deptford): The necessity for the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Longford does not arise. If Mr. De Cobain return and surrender himself to justice, he can apply to the Magistrate for bail on the ground that he wished to obey the order of the House, and no Magistrate in the country would refuse bail under the circumstances.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to withdraw the Amendment, and I think the best course for the right hon. Gentleman to adopt would be to put down a Motion for expelling the hon. Gentleman from the House a fortnight hence.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain do attend this House in his place upon Tuesday the 23rd of February.

### ORDER OF THE DAY.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [9th February] [See page 51.]

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

(4.25.) MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of the observations which I shall ask the permission of the House to make, I hope I may be permitted, on behalf of my hon. Friends and myself, to associate ourselves entirely with all that has fallen from the Leader of the House, and from my right hon. Friend who is acting as the Leader of the Opposition, with regard to the lamented death of the Duke of Clarence. In the fierce light which beats upon a Throne, the whole nation participates in the joys and sorrows of the Royal Family, and in the present case the pathetic circumstances which attended the death of the Duke, who had been cut off in the flower of his age, at a time when he was hopefully entering upon a new responsibility with the brightest prospects of domestic happiness, has appealed, I think, to our feelings of common humanity, so that the House of Commons in expressing its sympathy and its grief is only expressing the universal sentiment of the whole of the people. Sir, in such times we all feel that any condolence must be unavailing to assuage so bitter an affliction. But we know, on the authority of Her Majesty herself, that she and those members of the Royal Family who have suffered more severely have found some comfort in the knowledge that the whole of their people have sorrowed with them. Mr. Speaker, I should like also to say one word with regard to the loss which the House has sustained in the death of its

late Leader. Full justice has been already done to the eminent qualities of Mr. Smith, to his genial kindness, to his unswerving devotion to duty, to his unselfishness, and to his strong common sense—all the qualities which appear to me to be the very best characteristics of the English people. He had no claim to possess those showy gifts which in others have commanded popular admiration, but he had one exceptional quality to which reference has not been made. Mr. Smith was essentially a man of good counsel, and I think those who went to him for advice, whether in the position of personal friends or political colleagues, or political allies, always found him quick to seize the bearing of a question, able to appreciate the circumstances and to give trustworthy and sagacious advice. Sir, I think that the loss which the country and his party have sustained by his death in this respect has not, even yet, been fully realized. Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the more general topics suggested by the Queen's Speech, and the discussion that has hitherto taken place on that document. In the first place I am bound to express my surprise, I may even say my astonishment, at the course which the Debate has hitherto taken. I believe it is understood that the Debate on the Address at the beginning of the Session is not only an opportunity for a declaration of the policy of the Government, but an occasion eagerly seized by the Opposition to bring to the test the opinions which they have expressed in public during the Recess and to give a clear indication of their present attitude and intention. Sir, the Recess has been an exceedingly active one. We have been warned that this was to be a "fighting Session" and that the Opposition at least meant business. We have been told that the present is the worst and weakest Government which ever sat on these benches, that they are tottering to their fall, and that if they did not at the commencement of the Session perform the happy dispatch, the representatives of an indignant nation would combine to turn them out of their places and would force them to make room for abler and for better men. We have even heard

threats that on the first day of the Session a dissolution would be demanded, and that if a dissolution were refused, supplies would be stopped. [Opposition cheers.] I gather from the cheers behind me that I have only fairly stated the case—[No, no!]  
—well, I have given a short and incomplete summary of the oratory of the Recess, and what I want to point out is that in the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, delivered on Tuesday night, there was not from beginning to end one hint that these truculent intentions were going to be carried out. I paid to that speech the attention which its ability deserved, and from first to last there was not in it even a stray allusion to the Septennial Act, which we have been taught to look upon as, next to the Act of Union, the most iniquitous piece of legislation ever enacted. But yet there is no proposal from these Benches to repeal the Septennial Act. Even with the blushing honours of Rossendale thick upon him my right hon. Friend does not express any anxiety—he conceals the anxiety he feels—for a general appeal to the constituencies. What is his explanation? I thought that I had found it yesterday in a statement which appeared in the newspapers that my friend Mr. Schnadhorst had warned the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues that he could not, even with his machinery, produce a majority of more than 30 at the next election. But to-day Mr. Schnadhorst says he never promised them any majority at all. I think Mr. Schnadhorst was very wise. He has given proof of all the shrewdness with which I have been accustomed to credit him, and he is quite right not to prophesy unless he knows. But again I say that is not an explanation. How comes it then that this Session which was to come in like a roaring lion has come in like a bleating lamb. My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby occupied the great part of his very interesting speech in a somewhat discursive attack on a certain portion of one of several speeches made by the Prime Minister during the recess. I did not think that attack very relevant to the business in hand, and I have only one word to say

*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*

upon it, that I think it very hard that we should be accused of exciting to religious bigotry and intolerance, and insulting our Roman Catholic fellow subjects, when we are only pointing out the dangers of ecclesiastical domination. Where did we learn our lessons? We sat at the feet of two Gamaliels—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne. What is it the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian says, not in a speech in the excitement of party politics on a platform in the provinces, but in writing in a careful essay on the subject:—

“To secure rights has been, and is, the aim of Christian civilisation—to destroy them, and to establish the resistless domineering action of a purely central power, is the aim of Roman policy.”—*Vaticanism, 1875.*”

Is that an insult to the Roman Catholics? Is it true? If it be true, why do you blame us for saying the same thing? Then, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, a long way after, and with rather feeble voice, said—

“The Church, it has been truly said, has broken with knowledge, has taken her stand upon ignorance, and is striving with might and main, even in countries where she has no chance to use the machinery of popular Government, to keep back education. The worst enemy of Science is also the bitterest enemy of Democracy—*c'est le clericalisme.*”—*Fortnightly Review*, Feb., 1886.

Is it not a strange thing that a Gladstonian may steal a horse, whilst we may not look over the hedge? When did Lord Salisbury, or any of those who have been criticised by the Opposition, including myself, say anything worse than that? It is perfectly absurd to say that we have learned our lesson too well, when we have only repeated it *verbatim*. But the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was only intended to take us off the scent. He had not anything really to say about the policy or proposals of Her Majesty's Government. What he said was most friendly to us. In his most conciliatory manner, he was inclined to welcome those proposals and give them favourable consideration, and the only complaint he made—and this is the most amusing part of the whole thing, taken in conjunction with

what he and others said in the Recess—was that the Government have not provided enough work for this Parliament to do. He seems to think that all the principal Bills of the Government will, with his assistance, be cleared off by the end of July. Is he waiting for the dissolution? No, certainly not! He is prepared to go on, but does not think all the excellent material of this Parliament is to be wasted! and he wants us to proceed with District Councils and Registration and other items in the Government Programme. It is a most excellent frame of mind. I do not like to accuse my right hon. Friend of inconsistency, but there is a difference between the policy in the speech of my right hon. Friend and that of the Recess. Why, Sir, we were told in the Recess that every item of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, foreign and domestic, past, present and future, was to be arraigned as soon as Parliament met. My right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian denounced the continued occupation of Egypt. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle had his suspicions; he was distrustful of the Triple Alliance, and he gave us to understand he was prepared to reverse the whole Foreign Policy of the Government at a moment's notice. My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby was disconcerted about extensions in South Africa, and especially did it pain him to think that the Government were going to propose some addition to the expenditure in order to secure the abolition of the Slave Trade and to promote civilisation in that part of the world. On this, right hon. Gentlemen and all their followers were agreed, that as regards Local Government it was perfectly ridiculous to consider the question of Local Government for Ireland as long as the Crimes Act were in existence. That is a policy if you like. But what trace or hint of it is there in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. Everybody recollects the celebrated trial of "*Bardell v. Pickwick*," and how, after the case for the Plaintiff was opened by Mr. Skimpin, it appeared to the Court and the jury there was nothing in it. That is very like the indictment preferred against Her Majesty's Govern-

ment. But Mr. Skimpin was a junior counsel, whereas my right hon. Friend, in the absence of the Member for Midlothian, speaks with an authoritative voice. Well, Sir, let us take one question as a test. I say that by this extreme reticence on the part of my right hon. Friend we are left in doubt as to the intention of the Opposition. What are they going to do about Local Government in Ireland? My right hon. Friend and other speakers on the same side of the House gave us to understand during the Recess that, in their opinion, Local Government in Ireland was exclusively an Irish question, and, therefore, that it ought to be left to an Irish Parliament. Well, if that is their view, I should expect them to come down here and scout the idea of taking up the time of the House with a discussion on Local Government which, according to them, is perfectly futile and inept. Not a bit of it. My right hon. Friend says he is only eager that this question of Local Government should be brought to a second reading before Easter, and he goes on to promise that if the Bill is conceived in a liberal spirit, he and his friends will give it their support.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have always said so.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: My right hon. Friend has always said that Local Government in Ireland was for the Local Parliament, and is inconsistent now in being so ready to welcome the introduction of Local Government by the Imperial Authority. I wish to be perfectly fair to my right hon. Friend. He says they are willing to discuss the Local Government Measure, but that he does not consider it a final settlement of the question of self-government in Ireland. He appeals to me to say the same, and he appeals to a speech of mine delivered five years ago, and he quotes it as usual without the context; and I must say I take it as a very great compliment that my right hon. Friend is so continually quoting my speeches. He must have somewhere a cabinet choke full of my speeches.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: They are all on the "Round Table." (Laughter.)



MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am delighted to hear that my right hon. Friend still preserves the "Round Table." My right hon. Friend, however, keeps those speeches to make them, on occasions, the subject of his rather boisterous merriment. In the present instance, what is the state of the facts? In 1887, after the "Round Table" to which my right hon. Friend has just referred, I was making a speech in Birmingham, and I said what was perfectly true, both of Lord Hartington and myself, that after Mr. Gladstone's revolutionary proposals in 1886 we thought at the time the circumstances had altered, and that it would be impossible to look upon a mere scheme of Municipal Government as finally concluding the question of the government of Ireland, and that something more might have to be done; and I said that I was prepared to accept the principle of some kind of legislative authority in Dublin, provided that the conditions which Mr. Gladstone himself had attached to that concession, namely, the undoubted and unquestioned supremacy of the Imperial Parliament and the protection of minorities, could be guaranteed. My right hon. Friend challenges me, indiscreetly as I think under the circumstances, to produce any plan of my own by which this legislative authority in Dublin with the necessary securities may be created. That is a very fair challenge. I think my right hon. Friend was quite within his rights. We have no right to talk of a great subject involving sudden changes without being prepared to bring it to the test of public discussion. I think my right hon. Friend is justified in calling on me for details; only my right hon. Friend has forgotten somewhere or another on the "Table" my published plan, published at the time of which he speaks in all its details; a plan by which this might be secured. I have complied with his request; I have published my plan, and I must say it met with universal disapproval. It was ridiculed by the right hon. Gentleman, it was scornfully repudiated by the Irish Gentlemen below the Gangway. It was not accepted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I confess I was discouraged with what attended my honest attempt to deal with the matter. I

relinquish my plan; I am prepared to hand it over to my right hon. Friend. I do not refer to this with a view to disinterring a plan which fell still-born; but I do so in order to appeal to my right hon. Friend for a little reciprocity. He knows my plan now. Will he not tell me something about his? I do not ask for all the details; general lines will be quite sufficient for my purpose. Well, Sir, I have asked for this before, and I have been refused; but I am much more sanguine now than ever before. I have two reasons for thinking that at last the mask will fall, and this carefully guarded secret will be disclosed. I will put them before my right hon. Friend, who has an open mind on all questions, except, of course, questions of principle; and I will ask him to re-consider my application. My first reason for thinking he should change his policy is this: that this is the last Session of the present Parliament (Opposition cheers). Yes; we are all going (renewed Opposition cheers) to an election; some of us are going to come back (Ministerial cheers). I see many, many Members present, even in the ranks of the Opposition, who might well say *morituri te salutamus*; but surely the fact that we are going to our constituencies is a reason why we should let our constituencies know something of the policy upon which we are going to seek their approval or disapproval. We ought to know, it is not too early to ask for, the policy of the Opposition, which is to be their principal object if they go into power. It is not too early to ask that they should put that forward for general discussion, so that the country may pronounce upon it with full knowledge. But I have another reason even more strong, and that is that during the last 12 months a great deal of light has been thrown upon the subject which we did not get before—light as to the intentions and motives of hon. Gentlemen representing Irish constituencies; and I want to know whether my right hon. Friend and those who follow him have in any way modified their views in consequence of this light? This matter is really of extreme importance, and I shall have to trouble the House with a few quotations, and I hope the House

will appreciate them. What was the state of the case in 1886? The House and the country were asked to accept the Home Rule Bill, on the ground that it had been frankly, entirely, and completely accepted by the great majority of Representatives of Ireland as a full, final, and complete solution of the Irish question. This is what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle said immediately after the speech made by Mr. Parnell on the Second Reading of that Bill:—

“Now, Mr. Parnell said, in the most emphatic, clear, unmistakable, and for ever undeniable words, that the Irish nation in every section of it, both in Ireland and in the United States—and wherever Irishmen are found—that every section of the Irish people has accepted our plan. Gentlemen, this was a very serious announcement. It commits Mr. Parnell and his friends. They applauded his statement. It commits them to an endeavour—which I am thoroughly certain they have no intention of shirking or avoiding—to an endeavour to make our plan work, and to make this settlement what they say, a real, sincere and a final settlement.”

That was the conviction under which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle invited us to pass the Second Reading of the Home Rule Bill. Can he pretend he has any longer a similar conviction? I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman correctly represents, by giving *verbatim*, the speech of the late Mr. Parnell; but, at all events, I know this: that within the last twelve months Mr. Parnell declared, and his colleagues have declared, that he and they only accepted the proposals in the Home Rule Bill *pro tanto*, and as an instalment of their just rights. Mr. Parnell called it a trumped-up Bill; and it is perfectly certain that if the Home Rule Bill had been carried on the assurances of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, he himself and the country would have been bitterly deceived. Now, I want to know what reason has he for saying now, that for his new plan, whatever it may be, he will be able to get assurances from any section of the Irish Representatives which are one whit more trustworthy than those on which he relied in 1886? Now I will carry this a little further. What is the principle declared by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby to be the principal feature of this new

plan? He has refused to give us any details. I will quote his exact words. On the 17th April, 1891, he said:—

“The principle for which the Liberal Party had contended had been the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs, subject always to the control of the Imperial Parliament. That was the principle they had always proclaimed and depended upon, and that was the principle on which they would always stand.”

I must say that when my right hon. Friend speaks of a principle on which he is prepared to stand, I begin to think that our foundations are extremely insecure. He went on to say:—

“Mr. Parnell, up to the last moment, professed to accept that principle cordially and thoroughly, but he had now repudiated it, for reasons which he need not here explain. The system for which Mr. Parnell now contended was one which the Liberal Party had never countenanced, and which they would never support.”

There are two statements there to which I would call the attention of the House. First, here is a principle on which the Liberal Party, the Party represented by my right hon. Friend, will always stand—the principle of the control of the Imperial Parliament—and here is the second statement, that the system for which Mr. Parnell contends is one which they will never, never, never support. That is the most definite thing we have got yet. What is the system for which Mr. Parnell was then contending? Mr. Parnell expressed his intention at Waterford in January of 1891, and again he repeated it in the same words at the Leinster Hall in July. He said—

“It is now known to all men that when our Parliament has been restored to us it shall have power to make laws for Ireland, and that there shall be no English veto upon those laws except the Constitutional veto of the Crown, exercised in the same way as the Imperial Parliament.”

That is to say, Mr. Parnell says distinctly he will not have the control of the Imperial Parliament. He says the only control he will look at is what he calls the Constitutional veto of the Crown, which we all know to be a Constitutional figment, which has never been exercised during the present generation, and which could not be exercised without the most serious difficulties and complications. Here is, at all events, a broad distinction of

principle between my right hon. Friend and the Party he represents, and Mr. Parnell and the Party which is now led by the hon. Member for Waterford. I assume the hon. Member for Waterford is pledged to the principles laid down by Mr. Parnell. Then what is the position at which we have arrived? Remember, these right hon. Gentlemen have said again and again that they would think it a most stupid act of folly to bring forward any Home Rule Bill which had not the support of the majority, the great majority, of the representatives of Ireland. Very well, then at all events they are cut off altogether from all hope of any support from those representatives of Ireland for whom the Member for Waterford speaks. They cannot make it up with him without giving up the principle on which they are always, always going to stand. Of course it may be that in their opinion the hon. Member for Waterford and his friends are like the Dissident Liberals; they are doomed to extinction. Well, we shall see. That is a matter I shall leave to the hon. Member for Waterford to settle with my right hon. Friend. But I now come to a more important, numerically at any rate, section of the Irish Party—that section, the Anti-Parnellite, the National Party, I believe they call it. What is their position? The *Freeman's Journal* in December last (laughter from the Irish benches)—I wonder why hon. Members laugh. I will read what the *Freeman's Journal* says, and then I will ask the House to consider whether it fairly represents the Party of which it professes to be the organ. The *Freeman's Journal* in December 1891—I have not the exact date—says:—

“A deliberate attempt is being made to represent that the National Party would be willing to accept an abortion of Home Rule. We, therefore, state once again for the benefit of Mr. Redmond and those friends of his through the country who imagine that the late Mr. Parnell and his followers are the sole repositories of national independence that the definition of national self-government laid down by Mr. Parnell himself on 31st July, 1891, in which he referred to the essential provisions of the next Home Rule Bill, is entirely satisfactory to us as a fair definition so far as it goes of the only Home Rule which would be either safe or honourable for our people to accept.”

(Ministerial cheers). Has my right

Mr. J. Chamberlain

hon. Friend got that on the Round Table? I do not know that I understood the laughter just now when I quoted the *Freeman's Journal*. Does the passage in the *Freeman's Journal* correctly represent the views of the National Party? Do they, or do they not, adhere to the declaration of Mr. Parnell on 31st July, 1891? If they do not I leave them to the hon. Member for Waterford. If they say they do, how are they going to reconcile themselves to the right hon. Member for Derby? (Ministerial cheers.) Now, I appeal to the House. I appeal to the hon. Members who support the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. I say, “Is not it wise in your own interest to clear up this doubt? Are you going to the election not certain that when you come back a great part of your supporters will not turn their backs upon you?” That is the risk on one side or the other. Will the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby say now whether he still sticks to his declaration that there shall be the control of the Imperial Parliament, or does he mean to surrender that, as he has surrendered so much else? If he does not say that, will the hon. Member for Derry (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), who leads the National Party, say whether he is willing to make the concession, whether he is willing to take an abortion of a Home Rule Bill? Will he say whether he is willing to accept a subordinate Parliament? I do not know what the hon. Gentleman would say, but I do find that the attitude of the National Party, of those who are specially the friends of my right hon. Friend, is one which I should describe as a state of suspended suspicion. The National Party held a meeting at Mitchelstown on Sunday the 22nd November, which was addressed by the hon. Member for Mayo and the hon. Member for North-East Cork, who were both present, and must therefore be assumed to approve of the admirable Resolution which was passed at that meeting, namely:—

“Whilst we indignantly repudiate the allegation that the Irish Cause is to be made subservient to the exigencies of English Liberals we consider it prudent and patriotic to trust for the time being—(Laughter)—to the pledge of the Grand Old Man, reserving

to ourselves the right to refuse any Home Rule Bill derogatory to the power of Ireland."

Was there ever such a prospect before a benighted Party as that which awaits my right hon. Friend? No sooner does he read a first time his Bill, which is to contain provisions to make the Parliament in Ireland subordinate to the control of the Parliament of Great Britain, than the friends upon whom he rests entirely for his majority will withdraw, will consider it prudent and patriotic to withdraw from provisional trust in the pledge of the Grand Old Man, and will exercise their privilege of refusing a Home Rule Bill derogatory to the power of Ireland. I say, I think I have made out my case. I am not exacting. I ask for a little information. I ask my right hon. Friend, or anyone who speaks on his behalf, to say whether they adhere to that declaration which was made in April, 1891, that a Parliament in Dublin was to be under the control of the Imperial Parliament. I ask only for a single piece of information, but there are friends and supporters of the right hon. Gentleman who have asked for a great deal more. There is the *Pall Mall Gazette* for instance. In the Press they have used arguments much more cogent than mine to show the unwisdom of proceeding to a General Election without knowing really what the issue is for which we are contesting. There is the *Evening News*, which I believe is the great Gladstonian organ of Edinburgh, and the *Evening News* used very nearly the same language, except that I blush to say that they have spoken disrespectfully of my right hon. Friend, for they have even called him an "artful dodger." Then there is my hon. Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). He has put forward in the clearest language, the most conclusive language, his reason for desiring to have information on this subject, and he has said that if the information is not afforded it is very probable that even when they get the majority—which Mr. Schnadhorst will not promise them—the party will break to pieces as soon as the Home Rule Bill is introduced. What is really to be the position of the supporters of the Opposition if this information continue to be refused?

Really I think the sympathy of the House ought to be extended to them. (Laughter.) They will be in the position of those persons described in the well-known lines of Churchill:—

"Those sheep who never heard their shepherd's voice;  
Who did not know, yet would not learn their way;  
Who strayed themselves, yet grieved that I should stray."

Before I sit down there is one other point upon which I think the House is entitled to a little information, and that is with regard to the question of Egypt. I was perfectly amazed to find the extremely light way in which, after the speeches during the Recess, this important subject was passed over by my right hon. Friend the other night. In the course of the Recess the right hon. Members for Mid Lothian and Newcastle-on-Tyne were understood not only in this country, but in foreign countries, which is more important, to have advocated the immediate evacuation of Egypt, and if they doubt it I appeal to the foreign Press, and, above all, to the Press of France, which asserts it again and again. They did not hesitate in their speeches to embarrass the Government, to make its difficult task more difficult, and now when they have an opportunity to bring this question to discussion and to the test of a vote in the House of Commons, the speech which opens our proceedings by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition does not contain a single word about it. I could quite understand a patriotic silence which was governed by a desire not to embarrass the action of the Executive. But they have not been silent. They have done all the mischief possible by their platform speeches. Having spoken so loudly on the platform, when they come to this House they are as silent as mice. What was it that the right hon. Member for Midlothian said? He said—

"I shall indeed rejoice if before the day comes for the present Administration to give up the ghost, it be possible for Lord Salisbury to make an effort to relieve us from that burdensome and embarrassing occupation of Egypt, which so long as it lasts, rely upon it, must be a cause of weakness and a source of embarrassment."

There has been an attempt made to minimise these words. (Ministerial

cheers.) The right hon. Gentleman says "No." It was made in the organ of his Party, the *Daily News*, two days after the speech was delivered. I say the plain meaning of the speech, if words are intended to have any meaning, is that within six months, which is the longest time which the member for Midlothian has ever given to this Government to endure in recent days—that within six months Lord Salisbury is to take steps to arrange for the immediate evacuation of Egypt. If he thinks so, why does he not come here and say so? (Cheers.) Why does he only say it on a platform? I commented upon the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and I said it was due to an inability to meet pressure, to an unwillingness to face national obligations; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle took me to task, and he said according to my speech inability to meet pressure meant inability to violate pledges, and unwillingness to face responsibility meant a breach of public faith. Yes, but now I want to know, is that platform declamation, or is it serious opinion? (Ministerial cheers.) If it is platform declamation, I say it is unworthy and unpatriotic to attempt to discredit a Government without any real intention behind it. If it is serious opinion, I say that the right hon. Gentleman is bound at the earliest possible moment to bring this matter before the House, and to adhere to the statements which he made, and to endeavour, to the best of his ability, to relieve his country from the stigma of dishonesty which he seeks to impose upon it. What are the facts of the case? There have been only two pledges given by any Government with regard to Egypt—by the preceding Government, and by this Government—and those pledges were that we would leave the country as soon as the country was relieved from any fear of foreign invasion or domestic anarchy, and the other pledge was that we would not leave until that work has been fully and completely accomplished. We gave an estimate of six months.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That estimate was given by Lord Hartington.

*Mr. J. Chamberlain*

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Does the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby wish to separate Lord Hartington from the responsibility of the Cabinet? Now, we see the sincerity of the attacks which were made upon me during the recess, because it was said that I sought to put myself, as an individual, outside the Cabinet, for which I was jointly responsible. Sir, Lord Hartington spoke the language which he was instructed to speak by the Cabinet. We made the estimate of six months at that time. Later on Lord Salisbury appears to have made an estimate of three years as the probable time during which this work would be accomplished. It was not only Governments who made mistakes in this matter. Even the able officials who carried out the government of the country were mistaken, and believed that we could get to the end of the business much earlier than it has been possible to do. Both the estimate of Lord Hartington and of the Wolff Convention were mistaken. But our pledges remain absolutely intact. They have not been violated either in spirit or in any other way. It would have been cowardly and unworthy of this nation to allow that wonderful work which has been carried on in Egypt to be interrupted, to throw back the country to anarchy, or to allow it to be rescued from anarchy by the intervention of any Foreign Power. I say, therefore, if the language of right hon. Gentlemen during the recess has been misunderstood, they should take the earliest opportunity to correct themselves. But if they do mean what they appeared to mean, what it was said by the French and other foreign papers that they did mean—the immediate evacuation of Egypt—then we ought to know that these and other blessings are in store from the foreign as well as the domestic policy of a Government of which my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian should be the leader. In the course of his peroration, the Member for Derby made an eloquent appeal to the Whigs—the descendants of Fox, Burke, Russell, and Grey. Where are the Whigs? He turned round as if he expected to find, somewhere cowering on the back benches,

degenerate descendants of these great men. Why, Sir, it was only four or five years ago that my right hon. Friend used publicly to boast that he, himself, was the only living descendant of the Whigs—that he was the only man who had preserved intact and in their pristine purity the traditions of the principles of the Whigs for future ages. If that be true, why he himself then is the only person who can answer his question, “Where are the Whigs?” I am afraid the last of the Whigs is still stewing in Parnellite juice, and the shades of the great men he evoked, if they care at all for the condition of their sole representative, must shudder at the pitiful plight to which he has reduced himself. However, one thing I am confident of, and that is that the great Whigs to whom he appeals would never have consented to palm off upon their followers or upon the people of this country a policy which they could not define, or which they were unwilling to describe.

(5.23.) MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): Mr. Speaker, one of the many satisfactory circumstances attendant upon the tolerably speedy approach of the dissolution of the Parliament is that when that event happens we shall get rid of the unseemly comedy from which we have suffered so much during the last six years, of a gentleman sitting upon these benches denouncing and assailing from that position Liberal principles and Liberal measures and his old Liberal colleagues. The right hon. Gentleman asked, where are the Whigs? Where is the Radical? Sir, the right hon. Gentleman complains that we are afraid of bringing to the test of discussion in the House the assertions we made during the recess. (“Hear, hear!”) The right hon. Gentleman entirely misquotes. He did not quote in full. He says the declarations of my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian and myself pointed to instant evacuation. The right hon. Gentleman says that I desire a complete reversal of the foreign policy of the country. On the contrary, in all that I said upon Egypt I asked not for a reversal of foreign policy, but for a continuance of it. I said:—

“This remark will remain true until you have somebody at the Foreign Office with the courage to explain to his countrymen the effect of our occupation of Egypt upon our diplomatic relations, upon our military position. Somebody who will have the courage to describe the cost—I do not mean the money cost—but the whole cost in weakness of our position, military, diplomatic, and marine; somebody who will have the courage to point out that England in the present system of indefinite occupation in Egypt is a vulnerable England—England in constant risk of being drawn into the vortex of Continental war.”

Is that a reversal of the foreign policy of this country? The right hon. Gentleman referred to the Wolff Convention, but he does not seem to have acquainted himself with the full scope of that Instrument. Nothing can be more important than that this country should present, if possible, an unbroken front to foreign nations. I am as strong as he is in that view. Well, now I want to ask: Does Lord Salisbury contemplate the permanent and indefinite occupation of Egypt? If he does not, in what does he differ from me? If he were in favour of a definite occupation it would be discreditable to him, both to his statesmanship and his good faith. There is no foundation for such a charge, the action of Lord Salisbury completely establishes that. Let us see what happened. Lord Salisbury had not been in office many months before he despatched a special plenipotentiary, Sir Drummond Wolff, formerly a well-known Member of this House, to Turkey, and the first step he took was a Convention specially stipulating for a future arrangement regarding the withdrawal of British troops at a convenient period. That was the first step, and accordingly there came a second Convention, and in the month of May, 1887, Sir Drummond Wolff was instructed by Lord Salisbury to negotiate a Treaty with Turkey for the evacuation of Egypt by Great Britain, and the neutralisation of Egypt. It was stipulated, what? That at the end of three years from the date of that Convention the British Government should withdraw from Egypt, subject, I admit, to conditions of delay or return in certain specified cases of danger. Since May, 1887, the occasions specified as constituting special need for delay or return have never come about, therefore, if the Turkish Government had

ratified that Convention—as unfortunately, owing to some misunderstanding either on the part of Turkey, Russia or France, she did not do—if Turkey had ratified that Convention, this country would have been out of Egypt, which the right hon. Gentleman regards as so cowardly a betrayal of duty, in June, 1890. This Convention was deliberately tendered by Lord Salisbury to Turkey, and the right hon. Gentleman should be the very last person, I think, to use the language he has used to-night upon the subject because we cannot forget his own speech upon the subject in 1884. I would like first to complete the record of 1887. It is well that we should regard the language of the British Government towards Europe through the mouth of her plenipotentiary in a despatch approved by Lord Salisbury in May, 1887. They are important words, and should be in the minds of right hon. Gentlemen whether they are discussing this—which concerns the strength as well as the honour of England—in this House or on platforms—

“Her Majesty's Government had disclaimed all desire of annexing Egypt or establishing a protectorate over it. It has more than once been suggested that England should take permanent possession of Egypt, which would be a violation of the traditional policy of England, of her good faith to the Sultan, and of the public law. In time of peace it would have exposed England to continued jealousy and danger, and in time of war it would have been a weak point entailing a continual drain on her resources.”

What is the difference between the language used by Her Majesty's plenipotentiary and my own, that England in the persistent and indefinite occupation of Egypt is a vulnerable England, constantly in danger of being drawn into the vortex of European war? It was added that England was ready to promote the neutralisation of Egypt, not as master or mistress of Egypt, but as the mandatory of the other Powers; but the duty was regarded, and justly regarded, as a burden rather than a privilege. The House will observe this was put on two grounds—the violation of public law involved in an indefinite occupation; and the ground of danger and mischief to this country. What more did my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian say than was said by the plenipotentiary and approved by Lord Salisbury? The right hon. Gentleman

is the last person to use language of this kind. What did he say in 1884—and, mark you, he was in the Cabinet then?—

“The fulfilment of the pledges we have given has been delayed by circumstances which could not well have been foreseen, and now there is growing up in certain quarters a demand that our policy should be changed, and that we should make ourselves permanently responsible for the government and protectorate of Egypt. I should be inclined to pay some attention to the advice if it had not come from a very suspicious quarter. It comes from those who have always been in favour of annexation. There is a great party in this country which seems to have learned nothing by experience, which is always eager for an extension of an Empire already, I should think, vast enough to please the most inordinate ambition, and which taxes our resources to the utmost in the attempt to govern it well and wisely.”

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is annexation.

MR. J. MORLEY: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, but he was protesting the position of those who—

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Recommended annexation.

MR. J. MORLEY: “Make ourselves permanently responsible.” What else is the position taken up by the right hon. Gentleman now?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not said a single word here or anywhere else in favour of the permanent occupation of Egypt. What I have spoken of is remaining there till our work is accomplished, and I only complained of the language of the right hon. Gentleman because I believe it will tend directly to immediate evacuation.

MR. J. MORLEY: I think the language of which the right hon. Gentleman complains is exactly the language he used:—

“If we were to accept the advice so freely tendered to us I predict the temporary difficulties we have to face would become permanent dangers.”

That was in 1884. What change has taken place in the condition of things since that which enables us to distinguish between permanent annexation and the position the right hon. Gentleman now takes up? Will any hon. Gentleman opposite get up and define to us—the right hon. Gentleman himself cannot speak again—what are the conditions, what are the terms

*Mr. John Morley*

under which he conceives our work will be satisfactorily done?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I stated them distinctly; I said we had pledged ourselves not to leave Egypt until she was relieved from any fear of foreign invasion or domestic anarchy.

MR. J. MORLEY: If the right hon. Gentleman took the position described in his own passage, how can he take up his present position when, according to constant asseverations, the position of Egypt is stronger than it has ever been? The right hon. Gentleman forgets that he was a member of the Cabinet when he used that language, and he is the last man who, in order to find favour with his new allies, should use such language to endeavour to steer the country into a policy which he himself was most energetic in repudiating at the time, and for the repudiation of which he was, as much as any member of the Government, responsible, and he cannot divest himself of the responsibility by having left his colleagues of that day. He regretted that the hon. Member for Midlothian was not here; it was well for him that the right hon. Gentleman was not here. Perhaps I have said enough to explain our language, which has never been misunderstood by the foreign press; they have not understood it as pointing to an immediate evacuation. The right hon. Gentleman did me the honour to refer to a passage in my writings as to clerical domination. I have written a great deal about these very serious subjects, and I have nothing to retract or to withdraw; but the right hon. Gentleman has completely misunderstood, and may I say, without offence, misrepresented the charge that was made the other night by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby against the Prime Minister. We have never complained against him for speaking against clerical domination. He was speaking of the Catholic religion; of the majority of Ireland. The point of his excessively pungent speech was as to giving the power of the majority of the State, and therefore the power of the State, "to those who through long ages had been enemies of England." That is not the Catholic clergy. He

went on to say "they fought against us when we fought against Spain": that was not the clergy; "when we fought against America and against France": and that was not the clergy; "and this majority you are going to support and so place under their heels the rich and enlightened minority who are in sympathy with yourselves." So all that part of the right hon. Gentleman's argument, quoting from myself, was entirely wide of the mark. The assertion of the Prime Minister was certainly the most extraordinary I have ever heard from any man so accomplished as he is in matters of history. I am not going to weary the House with many extracts, but I should like to read one. First of all "they were against us in the American war"; the majority of Ireland was against us. What does Mr. Lecky, your own able and powerful Unionist historian, say:—

"The Republican religion of the Northern Presbyterians gave them some bias towards Republican Government, and their sympathy with the New England Puritans in their contest against England had been passionate and avowed."

So much for the American War. But before that Mr. Lecky says—I beg the House to notice this, because we shall hear of this again and again for several months—

"The Catholics of Ireland had maintained an absolute, unbroken tranquillity during the Scotch Rebellion of 1715; during the expedition organised against the House of Hanover by Alberoni in 1719; during the great Rebellion of 1745; during the long and desperate war with France that terminated in 1763, and amid all the complications that had since arisen."

In the American War it was not the Catholics who were against us, who moved a finger against us, it was the Republican Presbyterians of the North who were the passionate and avowed enemies of England. Then we come to the French War:—

"On the very eve of the rebellion of 1790," Mr. Lecky says, "the object of the Government was to separate as much as possible the Catholics from the Dissenters, and the Catholic question from the question of Reform. This was for some considerable time the keynote of the Irish Policy of the Duke of Portland, who was much struck with the fact that Protestant Ulster was the most disaffected of the four provinces, that at least five-sixths of the leaders of the United Irishmen were Protestants; that Munster, though



now disturbed, had shown itself perfectly loyal during the French expedition of 1796; that Connaught, the most purely Catholic province in Ireland, was the one province that was still almost untainted."

What are the names of the leaders of the so-called Rebels? Wolfe Tone, Napper Tandy, the Emmets, Hamilton Rowan, the Sheerses, Neilson, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and Arthur O'Connor, and every one of them not Catholics, but Protestants. There never was a more unfortunate declaration historically, or a more mischievous and provocative one politically. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say a great deal about the Local Government of Ireland, and he declares that we are guilty of inconsistency in opposing the project of the Government for Local Government in Ireland. But why should we oppose it? First of all you have got, thanks to the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, a majority in this House. Why should we embark on a dogged opposition to a measure which, if you are bent upon it, you can, undoubtedly, with your confederated majority, carry through. We have never said, and I do not think my right hon. Friend has ever said, or that the hon. Member for Midlothian has ever said, that we should resist the project of the Government for Local Government in Ireland. You bring in a Bill for extending local self-government in Ireland, and we know as well as possible that it can only be, fetter it and safeguard it as you can, a stepping-stone to the larger and safer policy. Why should we oppose it? I do not grasp the right hon. Gentleman's point. But when he says we are eager for it, he certainly misrepresents our position. I wonder what the feeling in the breasts of the Government supporters themselves is? I think they are as little eager and ready for this as the right hon. Gentleman accuses us of being. There is not one single section in Ireland, or any serious portion, to whom this proposal is not either odious, or contemptible. It is odious to the section represented by hon. Gentlemen sitting there, and contemptible to hon. Gentlemen sitting here. The First Lord of the Treasury himself, in the language he used at Plymouth, and afterwards at Huddersfield, seemed in

*Mr. J. Morley*

a very doubtful and apologetic state of mind about bringing it forward; and rather implied that he was doing so to carry out the undertaking given by his predecessor in that office and by the Government, before he himself was a Member of the Cabinet. He did distinctly imply that it was in consequence of that policy that he initiated it. He has never said one word in favour of it, except that it was taken up by his predecessor.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not my speech here, but I cannot accept that version of my speech.

MR. J. MORLEY: I read the right hon. Gentleman's speech and took it in that sense, but perhaps when we come to the words of the Bill and it is under discussion he will make the contradiction good. The Prime Minister at Newport, in 1885, said—

"That a large central authority was better than these multiplied local authorities, inasmuch as the wisdom of the central authority would neutralise the narrowness and passions of the local authorities."

At the memorable gathering, at Birmingham, in October, which consecrated the Alliance, the rank and file of the Tory Party passed a resolution throwing over their leaders, repudiating their Irish policy altogether. The hon. Member for South Tyrone, is he zealous for it? He says—

"If I were asked to provide for Ireland, it is not County Councils I should first of all supply, it would be something entirely different, but I recognise facts."

What facts, except that the Liberal Unionists have demanded it?

"I am not advocating what I think is theoretically the best for Ireland; on the contrary, we in Ireland may have to go through much tribulation, through these new Boards. In time to come, when calmer counsels prevail, they may even work for good. We may even now be shooting Niagara, but the venture must be made."

That is not a very enthusiastic way of approaching a reform which is to be the keystone of the Irish policy of the present Government. When that Bill is brought before the House I do not say we shall give it an entirely dispassionate and unprejudiced examination, because I think we have a deep conviction that the policy of the Bill is mistaken; that you are beginning at the wrong end; that you are preparing for yourselves or for your successors great

tribulation, and that the safeguards that you propose to guarantee the minority against the concessions you make to the majority will be absolutely inoperative for good, and can only operate for increased friction between the new bodies and the central authority at Dublin Castle. I want to know—we shall know no doubt when the time comes—whether that is what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham promised three or four years ago. He said—

“The Conservative Party are not averse to large and drastic changes in the Government of Ireland; they are prepared to consider and review the whole of the irritating system of administration which is known as Dublin Castle; but if they come to this they will be compelled, if they have not done so already, to accept the main principles of Mr. Gladstone's Bill.”

That is a passage standing absolutely by itself, and the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me if I do not read all the context. He goes on—

“They (the Conservative Party) will have to substitute for the administration of Dublin Castle some kind of legislative authority, subject to the guarantees Mr. Gladstone has laid down, and this will be the case, though they have rejected Mr. Gladstone's plan as dangerous and his guarantees as inadequate.”

We shall be curious to see, when the proposals for the improvement of local self-government in Ireland come before the House, if this promise of the right hon. Gentleman is fulfilled by his allies. Upon this point I do not admit that the representation of his views on Home Rule by the right hon. Member for Derby was in any sense a misconception or misrepresentation. The right hon. Gentleman talked about his plan. Which plan? I believe the right hon. Gentleman's pigeon holes are bulging with plans. Is it the plan of giving to Ireland the Canadian system of internal Government? Is it the plan which he told to his distinguished friend of that day, Mr. Hurlbert? Is it the plan which distinguished his views from the policy of the right hon. Member for Midlothian; that is to say, that the Government in Ireland was to be identical with that of the United States? All we know is that when he asks us what we mean by Home Rule, I should be at a loss to find a better definition of it than

his own, that if there is to be a substitute for the administration of Dublin Castle, it must be subject to the guarantees which Mr. Gladstone has laid down. He said—

“You must allow them to organise some form of Government. What the exact form of Government is to be concerns them much more than it does us. I should think if they were anxious to be economical and business-like, they would have as little red tape and form as possible; and they would be satisfied with a Standing Committee, with a Council of permanent officers of some kind or another. But if they thought they would be better served by imitating the cumbersome form of our Parliamentary Government, if they desired to have a Ministry—a Prime Minister, a Minister of Agriculture, a Minister of Public Works, a Minister of Education, and a Cabinet—all that I can say again is that it seems to me to be a matter entirely for their discretion, with which, at all events, I have no desire to interfere.”

Therefore, in 1887, which was long after all disputes as to the retention of Irish Members, the right hon. Gentleman himself was in favour of an Irish Parliament and an Irish Cabinet. The right hon. Gentleman asks for details, and in connection with that demand there is a very curious fact. He says that they want full knowledge. Who wants full knowledge? Rossendale does not want full knowledge. (Cheers.) Rossendale got such knowledge as justified us in claiming that election—whatever else you say about it, as must be evident to anybody who read the speeches of my hon. Friend the new Member for Rossendale—(cheers)—it justifies us in claiming that election as a triumph for Home Rule. (Cheers.) Was it not fought upon Home Rule? (Cries of “Yes!” and cheers.)

An hon. MEMBER: But all the details were not given.

MR. J. MORLEY: You say that all the details were not given. How can it be expected—which of you would expect—that all the provisions of a Bill are to be produced, to be examined, to be discussed and perfected upon a platform? It is without precedent. There are two places for the production, for the discussion, for the perfection of details of any such plan; there is first of all the Cabinet, and there is secondly Parliament. (Cheers.) And the country expects this; the country understands this; and your charge as to the knowledge of Rossendale not being

minute and in detail is beside the question. (Cheers.) What that election means, and the other elections fought upon the same lines, is this. It means that the electors say, "We accept the principle that Ireland is to have a legislative authority for affairs declared by Parliament to be Irish affairs; we understand you," they say to the Leaders of the Liberal Party, "to be prepared to provide for Irish representation at Westminster; we know that the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament is to be guarded, and we trust to you to devise a plan to carry out these views, and for shaping the fabric to be raised." I do not think any gentleman opposite can contradict the position. It is the position in which other matters have been discussed in the country and accepted by the country, and eventually produced in Parliament. If the constituencies have confidence in the intention, and in the ability of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and in his colleagues to perfect a plan upon the lines that our Party accept, and which they desire to see carried out, why should we listen to the bland and benevolent demands of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. If the Liberal Party is satisfied, why should we depart from the Constitutional usage to please the little handful who have quitted that Party. (Cheers.) I know as well as the right hon. Gentleman how many difficulties there may be in carrying out the policy of Home Rule. This is not the time to examine that matter, because I rather think the First Lord of the Treasury the other night complained of a right hon. Gentleman for introducing Home Rule into this discussion at all; this is not the time for going into all the difficulties that may confront us in regard to Home Rule. We know these difficulties. We do not quail before them—and when the General Election comes we shall then be face to face with you, and you only, who oppose Home Rule upon Conservative principles. We shall not be attacked by enemies in the flank—except by speeches—for the Liberal Unionists will have disappeared. The right hon. Gentleman himself knows, and nobody better, what sort of a figure the Liberal Unionists will cut

*Mr. J. Morley*

when the issue is placed before the country of carrying this measure of justice to Ireland, or of falling back upon the old position, which has made the Irish vote a dominant factor in politics. (Cheers.) It is said that you are going to give to the Irish priesthood the power of governing Ireland. That was implied by the Duke of Argyll, who said, "You are going to give to the Irish priesthood the power of returning the Irish Members." But supposing we are swept from Parliament at the next General Election, you will still have the Irish Members to deal with. The country now understands the issue. If the right hon. Gentleman and his friends believe that we are making promises which we shall not be able to fulfil, if they believe that we shall be brought face to face with difficulties that we cannot overcome, then the sooner they set us face to face with the constituencies the better. (Cheers.) And that is a question which the Government has not thought fit—and I do not think we have much right to blame them—to disclose their intentions upon; but this is worth remembering: that Lord Salisbury himself declared, in 1884, that the Prime Minister "might interpose his own will between the wishes of the country and a dissolution, yet such a course was not a Constitutional course;" and that is what we say to you, if there is a prolongation of this Parliament beyond the present Session, that you will be guilty of the same breach of Constitutional law which Lord Salisbury laid down in 1884. (Cheers.) I am willing to believe you have no intention of making such a breach. But the right hon. Gentleman says that we have not referred to dissolution. I have thought it proper to make that remark, and to say that we shall expect from the right hon. Gentleman opposite some assurance that the Constitutional point raised and affirmed by Lord Salisbury in 1884 will not be evaded in their own case. I thank the House for their attention, and I believe I have met all the points that are relevant to the discussion.

(6.10.) MR. JOHN E. REDMOND (Waterford): I have not risen for the purpose of replying to the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham; nor do I intend to refer to the topics discussed by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I recognise the grave importance of those topics, and when the proper time comes, as probably it will come very soon, Irish Members will be called upon to express their opinion as to the necessity of the Liberal Party dealing more in detail with proposals for Home Rule. I do not rise now for the purpose of discussing these topics to-night, for I recognise that they must furnish material for many debates during the Session upon which we have just entered. I propose, with the permission of the House, to divert the discussion into another channel, and to move an Amendment of which I have already given notice. It is to add at the end of the Address—

"And we humbly represent to your Majesty that the time has come when the cases of all prisoners convicted under the 'Treason Felony Act,' who are, and have been, for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland, may be advantageously reconsidered, with a view to the speedy release of these prisoners."

I do not think that it will be necessary to make any apology for introducing, at this early stage of the Session, a Motion for dealing with the amnesty of the prisoners convicted under the "Treason Felony Act." The prisoners to whom the Motion refers number 16, and they were convicted under circumstances that justify us in asking for their release; they are prisoners convicted of political offences, and I ask the House to agree with me that it is inexpedient that they should be further punished; and that, seeing that the liberty, and, perhaps, the lives of these 16 men are at stake; that the feeling of large masses of the Irish people are aroused upon this matter; that serious doubt exists as to the guilt of these prisoners, whether I am not justified in appealing to the House of Commons for the principle of fair play being extended to them. Last year I directed the attention of the House to the case of John Daly and of Egan, and I went into some detail in regard to their cases. To-night I propose to deal entirely, and by way of illustration, with the cases

of those two men. And let me first say upon what grounds I base my claims for reconsideration. I base my claims for amnesty upon three grounds, and I submit that if I establish any one of the three grounds it will be sufficient for proving the necessity of reconsideration. I say, first, that these are political offenders, and that being political offenders it is expedient to amnesty them. Secondly, I say that the convictions were wrong, and that in all the cases the convictions were obtained under circumstances which render it desirable that the punishment should be curtailed. Thirdly, I base my claim upon the fact that the prison treatment meted out to these men has been excessive, and has intensified the tortures of penal servitude because of the political offence of which they were convicted. I will only trespass for a short time upon the indulgence of the House in endeavouring to establish my case as based upon those three grounds. First, are they political offenders? The House will note that in the Amendment I submit to the House and speak of these prisoners as prisoners convicted under the Treason Felony Act, and who are, and have been for many years, undergoing imprisonment for participation in insurrectionary movements in Ireland. Last year there was a Return presented to Parliament of the names and sentences of all these men. I find that there are 16 of these prisoners, and that the whole 16 were convicted under the Treason Felony Act—that is, of having taken part in a conspiracy "to levy war against the Queen and to subvert the Empire." I know it is said of these men that they are dynamitards, and I know that prejudice has been raised against them by their being so-called. Now, it is unnecessary for us to say that we have no desire to palliate offences known as dynamite outrages. Those offences were not only stupid, but they were intensely criminal. The point I wish to make is that not a single one of these prisoners was convicted of any dynamite outrage whatever. In 1863, at the instance of the Member for Derby, the Explosives Act was passed for the purpose of dealing with dynamite outrages. Now, that

Act was not put into force with reference to any one of these men; it was not put into force, because the evidence which had aroused a certain amount of suspicion in reference to their cases, was not strong enough to obtain a conviction under it. The course of procedure of the Crown was that, having got sufficient evidence for suspicion against these men, they hounded back into the lives of each and all of them, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they in their youth, and so far back as in 1867, had not been members of the Fenian Brotherhood; and this was when some of the leaders of the Fenian movement had been amnestied, and when some of them were actually sitting upon the Benches of this House. They were in fact convicted and sentenced simply because they had been suspected of dynamite outrages. Take the case of Daly. The indictment against Daly was not an indictment for a dynamite outrage; it was not an indictment under the Explosives Act; he was convicted for having been a Fenian from the year 1867, and for a number of years afterwards. In order to make that point plain to the House it is only necessary to go to the account of the trial. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bury explained the charge, as what is known in legal language as Treason Felony; and of levying war and raising a conspiracy against the Queen in these realms. But Sir Henry James said—

"They had to go back to 1868; and certainly at that time an association had been formed called the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the object of which was to levy war and to establish an Irish Republic."

And then he goes on to say, in a long passage to explain the accountability of the prisoner, and as to certain documents in his possession as proof of his having taken part in the conspiracy. The learned Judge, in delivering sentence, said—

"The prisoner has been convicted of having conspired to sever Ireland from these dominions, and nobody who perused the documents could come to any other conclusion than that a wide-spread conspiracy existed for that purpose."

Now, neither in the indictment nor in the speeches of counsel for the Crown, nor in the declaration of the Judge

was the case treated as other than as a political offence—for having taking part in a conspiracy to raise insurrection in Ireland. In the case of Daly, and of Egan who was tried at the same time, they were not convicted of a dynamite offence. Daly was suspected of connection with dynamite, but convicted of a political offence, and I submit that he ought to have got the benefit that might arise from the fact that he was held to be a political offender. The evidence that he was a political offender goes back to 1868. This was an old, it was a stale, charge for there are thousands and thousands walking about in the light of day in Ireland and there are, I believe, Members in this House, against whom an offence of twenty years ago might be adduced such as that which led to the conviction of John Daly. No doubt the conviction is technically right, but what I urge is that you should give him the benefit of the fact of his having been convicted of a political offence. He was convicted upon evidence of an informer brought from Sligo. There was evidence given of his connection with the Fenian Movement in 1868 and 1883, and, having been convicted, he was sentenced to penal servitude for life; and the facts show that in his case, as in all the others, they were convicted of having been guilty of political offences. I submit that the cases of these men, every one of whom, with one exception, was sentenced to penal servitude for life, therefore demands re-consideration at the hands of the House. I know that the answer will be that the sentences were large because they were dynamitards. They were arrested and tried for treason felony, for a political offence, and having been convicted of a political offence they were sentenced as dynamitards; and I say that establishes a strong case why these sentences should be re-considered by the Government. The cases I have quoted of Daly and Egan are only sample cases. The same is true of all the 16 men, and I claim without going elaborately into the cases that I have shown that these men were convicted of political offences, and that it is only fair and just that the question of their continued incarceration should

*Mr. John E. Redmond*

be judged as the consideration of the cases of men who were so convicted and not of the case of the men who were convicted of the dynamite outrages; and I would seriously ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and I would seriously ask the House of Commons whether they think that anything is to be gained for the Empire, for the internal peace of these countries, for the cause of the Union, if you like, of Great Britain and Ireland by prolonging the punishment which has already existed in the case of these men so convicted of nine years in some cases and of eight in others, in view of the fact that for years and years ago amnesty has been granted for every political offender imprisoned in these cases, and in view of the fact that the dynamite conspiracy for suspicion of which these men were imprisoned is absolutely as everybody knows dead and gone. I would further ask the Government to consider what has been the effect of every act of amnesty that this country has extended towards political offenders. If the right hon. Gentleman were in a position to show that amnesties to similar offenders in the past had been attended with bad results he might have some reason for opposition to the Motion I make; but I think he will admit that the amnesty which was granted in past days so far from leading to renewed conspiracies has, in the cases of all the individuals who were amnestied, led to a better state of feeling towards this country and this Empire. Now, the second ground upon which I rest my claim for the amnesty of these men is that in some of the cases the convictions are tainted with the very gravest suspicion. First of all, I desire to point out that these convictions were obtained at a time of passion and prejudice in this country. Everybody will remember the excited state, the naturally excited state if you like, of public opinion when criminal efforts were made to injure public buildings and others by the use of explosives in the streets of this Metropolis, and everyone must remember the denunciations in the Press towards everything Irish and everybody who happened to be in Ireland; and I assert without bringing any accusation against

the fairness of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bury, and the other eminent Counsel who conducted these cases for the Crown, and without making any accusation against the fairness of the Judges—I think I may fairly say that any man who was accused of dynamite offences and who had been tried for treason felony was called a dynamitard in England: men who had suspicion raised against them could not expect, and did not receive from English jurors, that fair play which, under ordinary circumstances, they would receive from the hands of jurors in this country. Take again the case of Daly and Egan. What is the story of Daly? He was a man with whom very many men who sit around me in this House were very intimately acquainted for many years. He was a man who played an important part in the public life of Ireland. He was a man who held extreme opinions. He was a man with whom many of us here may have disagreed on many points; but I appeal to every man who is listening to me, who knew Daly personally, or who knew him through others, to bear me out when I say that through all the troublous times of the past he bore the character of, and remained, an honourable man. He was a comparatively young man and a man of great intelligence. He belonged to the Fenian organisation, but it is notorious that at all times he protested vehemently against anything in the shape of outrage, of assassination, or of murder. In 1883 John Daly went to America, and this dynamitard who was to eke out the rest of his days in Portland Gaol was hunted out of America by a section who were advocating dynamite in America—by O'Donovan Rossa and others who denounced him in their newspapers and hunted him out of America. He came back to England and took up his quarters in Birmingham in the house of an old schoolfellow and friend, and he remained there from the 11th of October till the 9th of April following; and at the trial the inspector of police, who gave evidence against Daly, said that during all that time he was followed day and night, and never lost sight of by the police, and the police never saw him

do anything suspicious; but suddenly he was arrested in Liverpool on the 11th of April—arrested under circumstances so extraordinary that I say, if they stood alone, they would constitute a justification for my claim that his case should be re-considered. On the 9th of April he received a telegram from a man in Liverpool who had been an old friend and confidant of his. The right hon. Gentleman knows his name. He asked him to go to Liverpool. He went on the 9th of April from Birmingham to Wolverhampton, and from thence to Liverpool; and the evidence of the police examined in the case is that when he arrived in Liverpool on the 9th of April the detectives lost sight of him. They did not know where he went; for two days he was absolutely out of their sight, and for all they knew he might have left the city. But suddenly, at eight o'clock on the morning of the 11th of April, he went to the railway station at Birkenhead to get a ticket, and when he walked into the booking office carrying with him a brown paper parcel, which had been handed to him half an hour before by this very man, whose name the right hon. Gentleman knows, who was never arrested, who left the country and was never heard of since—when he went into that station at 8 o'clock that morning he found the police to the number of 25 in that place surrounding the booking office, one with a black bag ready to carry away the parcel, and another with hand-cuffs and so on, and he was arrested on the spot. And Constable Humphries, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, who effected the arrest, was asked at the trial by Daly, who defended himself, why he arrested him, as Inspector Stroud had sworn that during the seven months he followed him night and day he never saw him doing anything suspicious; and the answer Humphries gave was—"Oh, we saw your pockets bulky and we arrested you in consequence." Now, at the trial all the attempts made by Daly, and necessarily they were clumsy attempts, to trace up this matter of the man who gave him the package were peremptorily stopped by the Judge, on the objection taken by the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Bury. Under these circumstances I claim that

*Mr. John E. Redmond*

if the case of Daly stood there alone a sufficient case would have been made for the gravest suspicions as to whether his connection with this parcel was not part of a deliberate plot on the part of the Irish police who were at that time in London and other parts of England, for the purpose of hunting out this dynamite conspiracy. But the case does not stop there. The case developed two or three years after his conviction in a manner which fairly startled anybody who took any interest in it, because a charge of the most horrible character was made against the Irish police, and an accusation was made by an English gentleman of high official position, occupying the position of chief of the police in the important town of Birmingham, Mr. Farndale; by a man who had been in control of the detectives during these seven months, who had been watching Daly. It was the statement of a man who knew what he was talking about, and knew of the efforts to take Daly, in this conspiracy net, and a gentleman who having made this accusation stood by it, and, as far as I have information, stands by it. He is still a trusted official of the Government, and entrusted with the highly important duties which belong to the office he holds. What was his statement? He made the statement first to an Alderman of the City of Birmingham, called Manton, and then he made the statement to the Watch Committee in the City of Birmingham, and his statement in a sentence was this, that he was determined to rest no longer with this load upon his conscience and mind of the knowledge which he possessed of the way in which this parcel of explosives had been planted on Daly's person, and he solemnly made the accusation that that parcel had been planted on Daly by an agent in the pay of the Irish police, that that agent had been receiving the pay of the Government for a considerable time before this transaction, that these explosives were actually bought and supplied by the Government through the agency of the Irish police, and that agent of the Government the right hon. Gentleman knows, and he has left the country, and he handed the parcel to Daly half-an-hour before he was arrested. The

man who handed the parcel to Daly told the police to bring their men to Birkenhead and wait for Daly, and then the man disappeared. Here is the statement. The words of Alderman Manton in a letter addressed on the 6th October, 1887, to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary —

"Mr. Farndale swore on oath—Mr. Manton, you will be surprised when I tell you that the explosives found on Daly were planted on him by the police. . . . Mr. Farndale replied, 'really so!' I said to him 'are you absolutely sure?' Mr. Farndale said 'I am, and I promise you that I will never engage in another such a business as long as I live.

That statement was brought under the attention of the Government and the Home Secretary, and I would seriously ask the House of Commons to consider for one moment what a grave accusation that was to bring, and what a terrible position it was which it placed all those who were responsible for the administration of justice in these matters. What did the right hon. Gentleman do? He told us in the last debate he sent for Mr. Farndale, and though he had a private investigation he refused to tell us anything about the investigation, he refused to tell us what evidence was adduced there and whether it was evidence taken upon oath. In fact, we know absolutely nothing about the private investigation except this, that the right hon. Gentleman says he, the Home Secretary, convinced himself that Mr. Farndale was wrong. I asked him did the investigation convince Mr. Farndale that he was wrong. He said—"No," and there the matter rests. An investigation is held into this terrible charge, the investigation ends by the Home Secretary convincing himself that the accusation was untrue, and Mr. Farndale remaining in the same position, and Daly is left these years to rot in gaol under this accusation. I submit that this investigation of the Home Secretary leaves this matter in a most unsatisfactory position. The right hon. Gentleman says he thinks that the horrible accusation against the police was all wrong but he still continues in a responsible position the man who made such a horrible accusation and who will still persists that the accusation is true. I venture to submit

that the question is an extraordinary one at the very least, and all I ask from the right hon. Gentleman is that he may institute something like a real and *bona fide* investigation into this matter. Chief Constable Farndale was the only police official in a responsible position who was not called at the trial. If Chief Constable Farndale had been called and like a truthful and honest man had stated in the box what he stated afterwards, do you believe that any jury of Englishmen would have convicted Daly? No. Under these circumstances, is it too much for us to ask if you would institute a fresh investigation into this case? My friend reminds me there might have been a verdict of treason felony, notwithstanding Chief Constable Farndale's evidence. I do not believe that there would. I believe that if Chief Constable Farndale had given that evidence, the jury would have been so disgusted that they would have refused to find any verdict whatever for the Crown. Does the right hon. Gentleman not think for the sake of satisfying the minds of large masses of the Irish people who know Daly, and from their knowledge of him know him to be incapable of being a dynamitard, does he not think that, after what has taken place, for the sake of satisfying their minds and for the sake of the purity of the administration of justice in England he ought to grant a new investigation? We believe that no matter how bitter an enemy of your rule in Ireland Daly may have been that he was not an assassin, and was not implicated in this plot; and strong in that belief we urge upon you in the name of justice to grant this man another investigation. Now, what I said of Daly I can say of all the others in the list. Yet a still harder case than of Daly is the case of James Egan. Egan was convicted solely, just as in the case of Daly, so far as proof goes, of being a Fenian. But there was this difference between the two cases, that whereas it was shown that Daly had been in communication within recent years with men supposed to have been connected with the Fenian Conspiracy, it was shown conclusively that since the year 1875 Egan had no connection with the Fenian Organisation what-



ever. He was tried in 1884. It was shown that he had been a Fenian before 1875—nine years before. During that period of nine years there was not one tittle of evidence to show that Egan had ever been a Fenian, or connected with the Fenian Organisation. So far as evidence raising suspicion is concerned, there is only one piece of evidence against Egan—namely, that there was found in the corner of a large garden at the back of his house a little bottle, I believe only about an inch long, containing a small quantity of nitro-glycerine, and Daly declared in the most solemn way that it was he who buried the bottle in Egan's garden. No doubt was expressed during the trial as to the truth of that statement, and the Judge in sentencing Egan said that while it was clear upon the evidence that he ought to be convicted as a Fenian, there was a shadow of a doubt as to his guilt as a dynamiter. Well, if there was a shadow of a doubt in Egan's case as to the suspicion of dynamite, surely the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary might fairly re-consider Egan's case, seeing that he has now served eight years of torture in Portland and in Chatham. Egan's case is the hardest of all the prisoners convicted of treason-felony. The mere fact that the convict Daly lodged in Egan's house is no proof of Egan's complicity in Daly's crime. I have seen him, owing to the spirit of courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, who has given me most ample opportunity for seeing the prisoners. I desire to thank him publicly for his courtesy. I have seen Egan and I have seen something of his life. He was a man of absolutely blameless life, a man who by years of industry had raised himself to a position of trust in Birmingham. There was absolutely nothing against him except this misfortune. Daly, whom the Irish police had determined to drag, by fair or by foul means, into their net, unfortunately went to lodge in the house of his old friend Egan. From that moment suspicion was raised against Egan. The police went down to the garden and found there the bottle containing the nitro-glycerine and they knew that Egan,

like Daly, had been a Fenian. Egan is a delicate man, and the life that he and the others are leading is killing them. It is impossible to see them month after month without seeing that they are dying almost before one's face. In the case of Daly I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman for a re-investigation. In the case of Egan I appeal for a re-consideration of the sentence—as to whether nine years of torture in Portland is not enough for having given shelter to his friend Daly for seven months in one year. There are, in all, sixteen cases; there was suspicion of dynamite in all; there was a conviction for treason in all. I cannot possibly deal with the whole of the sixteen cases, and I have mentioned these two as samples. Sir, I think I have shown, firstly, that these men are entitled to be treated as political offenders; and, secondly, that with reference to some of the cases there are circumstances of suspicion which ought to give rise to a consideration of their cases. I come to the last ground on which I base my appeal. The prison treatment to which these men have been subjected is cruel in the extreme. I do not make any accusation against the prison officials, but what I complain of is that within the rules—without breaking one of them—these men have been subjected to a course of treatment which makes penal servitude a far greater torture than it is to convicts in ordinary establishments. Daly, moreover, was poisoned accidentally on three occasions in gaol. He was told he was dying, and he believed he was dying. On one of those occasions he made a very touching declaration, which is recorded in the Blue Book, declaring the absolute innocence of Egan of any knowledge of the bottle in the garden, or of his (Daly's) political opinions. No authority is given to endanger a man's life when he is sent to penal servitude, and, therefore, the fact that he has been poisoned on three occasions should be taken into account. Now, though I would be sorry to outstep the limits of the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman, or to abuse the privileges he has extended to me, I should like to say something as to the system of treatment to which these prisoners are subjected. One thing that renders convict

*Mr. John E. Redmond*

life more easy after a while is that if the convict behaves himself well he is taught some kind of trade, and by degrees will get skilful in that trade and take an interest in it, and it is manifest that working in association, the men find a new interest in life, which enables them to pass their days better than they otherwise would. In the case of these Irish prisoners there has been an exception. They have never been allowed to learn a trade. They have been kept apart from all other prisoners. In Portland they are kept in what are called penal cells, originally built for refractory prisoners, the windows of which are covered with perforated iron, so that they cannot get so much as glimpse of the sky. They are kept for sixteen and a half hours in these cells, and for six and a half hours they are put to work, not in a room or in the open air, but in a dark corridor leading from one part of the prison to another. There they are employed chopping sticks, pumping water, and mending old flannel shirts. Only one hour per day is allowed them for exercise—for fresh air. On the whole case, I submit that these men were convicted as political offenders; that as such their cases ought to be reconsidered; that as to some cases there is doubt as to their conviction, and that these should be specially considered; and finally with reference to all the cases, the punishment meted out has been of a peculiarly savage and terrible character. There is in Ireland a widespread feeling in favour of the men, and I sincerely trust that in the claim I make for the reconsideration of their cases I will have the support of all sections of this House. I hope the Nationalist representatives will speak to-night with a united voice. Finally, Sir, I would ask, What is to be gained by keeping these men in prison? Absolutely nothing. This dynamite scare is dead. Its folly, its wickedness, its absolute uselessness has been proved before the whole world. Any further detention of these men will amount to vindictiveness and cruelty. On the other hand what is to be gained by releasing them? It always adds to the strength of the strong to be merciful. An exhibition of clemency never endangered authority in this or any other

country in the world. The act of clemency for which I now ask will for ever redound to the honour of this country, and I appeal to the House, to rise above the prejudices and the passions which surround this question and to send a message of peace and forgiveness which I believe will find a responsive echo in the hearts of the Irish people throughout the world, and which will do more to strengthen your Empire and to prevent the recurrence of such conspiracies than any exhibition of vindictiveness and cruelty.

\*(7.20.) THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): Mr. Speaker, I think no one can complain of the tone and spirit in which the hon. Gentleman has presented his case to the House. I must, however, decline to follow the hon. Member into his narrative of prison treatment. I am sure he must see and feel it is quite impossible that details of prison discipline can be usefully, and indeed, truthfully, discussed between a prisoner and his private friend, and if I decline to deal with any complaint not made through the constituted authority, I do not in the least complain of what the hon. Gentleman said. He said he did not charge the prison authorities with harshness or injustice. In a recent inquiry it was shown that the treatment of the Irish prisoners differed in no respect from that of any other convict having received a similar sentence, and undergoing it in the same prison. If the House is of opinion that the treatment of convict prisoners is too severe and requires to be overhauled, that is a matter upon which I am perfectly ready to enter; but to discuss the system of convict treatment and convict discipline as a bye-question in a debate of this sort would be highly undesirable. The other two points raised by the hon. Member fully deserve an answer. The hon. Member in an extremely ingenious argument contended that the whole of the sixteen prisoners, whose names were mentioned in the Return laid on the Table of the House last year, are political prisoners because their conviction was for treason-felony. I must

absolutely take exception to that. I allege that every one of these sixteen prisoners is a dynamite prisoner having been found guilty of dynamite offences, upon which their conviction proceeded. The hon. Gentleman was entitled to urge that technically and in legal parlance their offence was treason-felony, but he overlooked the fact that the dynamite might be used against a private person to cause injury to that person, and then the offence would not be treason-felony; but it might also be used for a public object—to bring about a change of Government, to alter the advisers of the Crown. Then the offence becomes treason-felony and is technically called levying war against the Crown. Am I, however, to be told that because the purpose for which dynamite is used is not merely injury to a private person, but to a whole class, or party, or Government, that therefore its use becomes less infamous, less disgraceful, less deserving of the severest punishment? Hon. Members might turn to the pages of the weightiest authority on the point I can mention, namely, the Report of the Commissioners on Extradition, comprising the most eminent lawyers. There were the late Lord Chief Justice, Baron Bramwell, the present Master of the Rolls, Sir James Stephen, who as a criminal lawyer stands second to none, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, a constitutional lawyer who could give lessons to many. Well, then, the Extradition Commissioners stated—

"The principle hitherto adopted in the matter of extradition, of excluding offences of a political character should therefore be maintained."

"But it becomes a very different thing when, in furtherance of some political or pretended political purpose, some foul crime, such as assassination or incendiarism, is committed. Thus, attempts by conspirators to assassinate a reigning Sovereign, regardless, perhaps, that in doing so other lives may be sacrificed; or the setting fire to a prison, at the risk of burning all those within it; or the murder of the police for the purpose of rescuing prisoners in custody for political offences, are crimes in respect of which, though the motive was a political one, we cannot think that any immunity should be afforded. Civil war and insurrection take place openly, in the face of day, and may or may not be justified or excused by circumstances; but assassination or other forms of revolting crime lose none of their

atrociousness from their connection with political motive."

"Generally speaking, we would therefore decline to recognise the suggestion of a political motive as a ground on which a magistrate or judge should refuse a demand for the surrender of a person accused of what (in the absence of such motive) would be an ordinary crime, unless the act to which a political character was sought to be ascribed occurred during a time of civil war or open insurrection."

That is about as sound and tenable a distinction as could be made in a matter that presents some difficulty. It was also pointed out by the Commissioners that if you have a state of civil war and insurrection, the violence inflicted upon one party by another took place openly and in the face of day; that each man had warning of the attack and knew what to expect. But those dynamite outrages have none of those features. There was no warning to the enemy to stand upon their guard, but there were all the elements of secret contrivance that constituted an odious and a dangerous crime. I regret that the hon. Gentleman indulged in that argument about political offences without stating what the character of the offence committed by these 16 persons was. Daly and Egan were charged with a dynamite offence; this was proved in the evidence, and was treated in the summing up of the Judge to the jury as a dynamite offence. There were two counts in the indictment, in which they were charged with having aided a treasonable object; and, with design to overthrow the power and authority of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, in that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland, having in their possession at Birmingham 15 ounces of nitro-glycerine with intent to employ the same in furtherance of that object; and that in furtherance of their treasonable object they had also dynamite and dynamite bombs, four dynamite shells, and one pound of dynamite in their possession.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (North Longford): Did the conviction cover all the counts in the indictment?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Yes, the conviction was general, and covered all the counts. It was not proved for what purpose the bombs were to be used. These bombs were such as were capable of being thrown from the

*Mr. Matthews*

gallery of this House. ("Oh, oh!" from Irish Members.) I do not know from whom these sounds are uttered.

MR. J. REDMOND: This is a very unfair suggestion. There is not one tittle of proof behind it.

MR. MATTHEWS: I do not say it has been proved. I say these bombs were capable of being used in that way. It would be difficult for ingenuity to suggest for what innocent purpose the bombs were intended. I have yet to learn that is not a purpose for which the bombs found on Daly could be used. That was the case of Daly and Egan. Nitro-glycerine buried in Egan's garden: bombs found on the person of Daly. Then there is a large group in which McCullagh, Devany, Callaghan, and others figure. They were charged in connection with explosions at the Glasgow Gas Works, at Possil Bridge, and Buchanan Street Railway Station. Each of these explosions took place on the same night, and these men were all members of the Irish Brotherhood. The explosives found were in certain tubes brought from Cork to Liverpool. Is that to be treated as a political offence when railway bridges, and gas works in a town in Scotland are made the object of a dynamite explosion? I must leave it to the common sense of the House to deal with such a case as that. Then there is the case of Whitehead, Gallagher, Wilson, and Curtin. That was a case in which dynamite was found in india-rubber bags, sent by Gallagher to Whitehead's house, in order to bring to London nitro-glycerine, of which Whitehead manufactured large quantities. Gallagher said this explosive was to blow up the House of Commons and other large buildings in London. Can that be honoured with the name of a mere political offence? It is an outrage of the most wanton kind which anyone can imagine. Two other of the prisoners are Featherstone and Dalton. They were men in the possession of an ingeniously constructed infernal machine such as those used at the Glasgow and at the Local Government Board explosions. These explosives were also brought from Cork to Liverpool.

MR. J. REDMOND: Has the right hon. Gentleman ever heard of Macdermott?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am speaking of the character of the offences. The hon. Member is referring to some individual whose acquaintance I have not the honour to possess, and who he says was really the culprit. I pray that hon. Members may keep their minds to the point. I say these are all dynamite offences, and the appeal for clemency made by the hon. Member for Waterford in his very temperate speech seems to me inappropriate. I know of no reason why offences certainly most dangerous should be treated with exceptional leniency except it could be suggested that the class of offence was not likely to be committed again; and that the deterrent object of severe punishment was no longer called for in the public interest. That is a kind of argument which a person in my position might be inclined to listen to. But that cannot be said. Within the last month or two we have had explosions in Ireland, which show that the use of explosives has not yet been abandoned, and there have been indications in more than one quarter in England as well. No one can suggest that these are political offences, dealing in these extremely dangerous explosives. Quite apart from any sympathies or antipathies, this is a class of offence which is the least deserving of sympathy. Considering the advance in chemical knowledge at the present day, and the terrible increase in the power of explosives put within the reach of any mischievous or malicious person, it seems to me that public safety demands, that when explosives of this kind have been prepared in order to commit outrages, the most stringent and deterrent punishment should follow conviction. The appeals for mercy might be appropriate if you were dealing with a political party fighting in a fair way, but they are altogether inappropriate when you are dealing with secret and malicious offenders. Then the hon. Member says the conviction of Daly for treason felony was wrong. No doubt that would be so if the object had been to inflict a wrong upon a private person, but it was not wrong where the guilty party sought to injure the Government of the Queen, and change Her councils by the use of

dynamite bombs, and by having nitro-glycerine concealed in a garden. The use of dynamite may be for private mischief or for public mischief. When for public mischief it is called treason felony. The hon. Gentleman has referred to Mr. Farndale's opinion, I am not Mr. Farndale's superior, and I have no right to call him to account, and I desire to say nothing of him which is not respectful. But after the most careful inquiry I am convinced that the inferences which Mr. Farndale drew from what little he knew of Daly's capture were inferences which were entirely mistaken. The inference he drew was that the bombs had been planted upon Daly by the police. I instituted an inquiry into the matter and I say what I think will probably not surprise the hon. Member if Daly has been candid with him, that I am satisfied from inquiries I made, that Daly applied to Breslin of New York for money and these bombs, and that he received from New York both the money and the bombs. I have no doubt that this is the fact.

MR. J. REDMOND: Was that proved at the trial?

MR. MATTHEWS: No it was not proved at the trial, but that is what I assert to the House.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: Breslin is dead.

MR. MATTHEWS: I say the result of my inquiry is that bombs were applied for by Daly in New York and were received by him from Breslin in New York, together with money.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: Will you lay that information on the Table of the House.

MR. MATTHEWS: Certainly not. I am here, in my capacity as Minister, asked to extend mercy to Daly, and I tell the House of Commons what steps I have taken to ascertain whether the charge made against officials of the Government is well founded or not. These things were laid before the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby from day to day as the case proceeded, and the greatest care was taken to sift every piece of information which came before the Home Office. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby is my political opponent, but I trust I am not so

unfair as not to pronounce him, in my opinion, right in the inquiry into the material before him at the time of Daly's conviction. I came to the conclusion that that these matters were fully and satisfactorily established. The hon. Member says that the bombs were bought by and the money given by the police. I say that is untrue. The police never purchased bombs nor gave money, either directly or indirectly. The bombs came from New York. They came from a person about whom I need not give any information ("Oh, oh!" from the Irish benches). Do you suggest that John Breslin was the agent of the Government? (Cries of "No!") Then that is the person from whom they came. He sent them over under the description of "love apples" for purposes which were not proved, but which could only be of one kind. To talk about a plant is a dream and altogether an inaccurate suggestion of Mr. Farndale. Why was he not called at the trial? Because he knew nothing about all these facts. He knew nothing about the bombs or how they came into Daly's possession. He conjectured and drew inferences from facts of which he had no personal knowledge of his own. The hon. Member says, Will you investigate further? No further investigation would throw any light upon the subject. I have been reminded that one agent in the transaction, a gentleman in New York, is dead. Every day makes it more difficult to arrive at any fresh information. All the materials were before the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and have been reviewed by me, and I am perfectly satisfied of their genuineness. I am persuaded that no fresh inquiry is necessary, and that this suggestion of a plant by the police is an absolutely unfounded suggestion. For these reasons, therefore, I must decline to make any further inquiry and to go into this matter over again. I must decline to extend any mercy to Daly upon the suggestion that his conviction was not only wrong, but obtained by infamous means. If there were the slightest foundation for supposing that the agents of the Government, whether the police of England or Ireland had bought these bombs and foisted them

*Mr. Matthews*

off upon Daly, that would be conduct so disgraceful, that not only should Daly not be detained a day longer, but the most ample compensation and apology should be made to him. There is no middle course. There was either absolutely infamous conduct on the part of the police, which I do not believe, or Daly was justly convicted. With regard to Egan it would be extremely injudicious and unwise to give any pledge or to say what may happen across the floor of this House. I have stated that the case against Egan was a different one from that against Daly. But looking to the character of the letters and looking to all the circumstances, I have never been able to doubt that Egan knew that nitro-glycerine was buried in his garden, and therefore he was assisting the preparations for these awful explosions. Egan was therefore an accomplice and participator with Daly in the possession of these explosives, and in the knowledge that they were being accumulated for an unlawful purpose. But I do not think there is against Egan any proof that he participated in the active use of this explosive material, though I cannot doubt that he was cognisant of the kind of use that they were intended for. That is an offence, no doubt, of a lighter kind, and the time may possibly come when it will be possible to reconsider the case of Egan, but that time is not yet. With regard to the other prisoners, the hon. Member has entered into no details—I shall follow his example. It has been my duty, at one time or another, to examine the evidence against all the prisoners, and I have examined it with a mind perfectly unbiassed, and I hope as open as possible to any flaw which I could detect in the evidence against the prisoners. But I am bound to tell the hon. Member that I have not found anything unsatisfactory in any one of the six or seven cases, which has induced me to doubt that the men were properly convicted of dynamite offences, and that they were convicted of offences of a very dangerous character, towards which leniency or clemency is in no respect the right policy. I quite disregard the political flavour attempted to be given to the

case of Daly. I admit that Daly is not a man of the same character as those who caused the explosions in London or in Glasgow. I can only think of Daly as a fanatic, a dangerous fanatic, who was ready to risk his life for purposes which he appeared to consider important. That is not a man of the same class or character as those who caused the explosion in the railway station in London or the gasworks at Glasgow or Possil Bridge. The one man is far more cultured, far more intelligent, and I dare say, in many departments of private life, is a far superior person. But that the social danger is fully as great as with the commonest and coarsest criminal is so obvious that it is hardly necessary to enforce it by any argument. These dynamite offences work the most widespread and terrible damage to innocent persons in the twinkling of an eye, and the difficulty of detection is always very great. The House must know that many dynamite explosions have completely escaped the efforts of the police to bring the perpetrators of them to justice. It is a class of offence very dangerous in its character and very destructive in its effects, and it would be the very worst policy in these days when the use of explosives is better understood than formerly by evil-disposed persons, to show leniency as if they were not offences of the grossest kind. On these grounds I regret that I cannot give a more favourable answer to the right hon. Gentleman's request. The hon. Gentleman says there is sympathy in Ireland with these men. I deplore the fact that there is considerable sympathy for many of these men—I hope not for all—in Ireland. I regret it. It think it is most misplaced sympathy. If the Irish people knew the facts of this case as fully as I do they would not sympathise. I can only deplore that a certain halo of romance is thrown round some of those offenders, and in the circumstances, perhaps, one cannot wonder at the chivalrous way in which the hon. Member has pleaded their case in this House. While, on the one hand, I can understand that Irishmen are sorry to see any of their countrymen in prison for such offences, it would be wiser and more dignified on their part to acknow-

ledge that offences of this sort can in a civilised State only be dealt with in one way, by very severe punishment which ought not to be excessive, but which must be proportioned to the gravity of the offence. The whole administration of justice would be interfered with if, on the grounds of nationality, we were to interfere with the punishment awarded for such offences.

(8.30.) MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary): The right hon. Gentleman, as he concluded his speech, spoke, as he said, as a Minister of the Crown. It needed some assurance upon his part that he was a Minister of the Crown, or otherwise I should have thought, and many Members of the House would have thought, that the right hon. Gentleman was addressing a packed Irish jury in a Government prosecution in Ireland. (Cheers.) The right hon. Gentleman also made revelations that would become a Crown Prosecutor rather than a Minister of the Crown defending the administration of his Department in this House. I can conceive nothing more mean than the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman that the bombs found upon John Daly, and which it has been clearly proved were planted upon him without his knowledge, were intended to be thrown into the midst of hon. Members. Daly and his associates were tried in passion, convicted in passion, and they are to be retained in passion by an appeal to the passions of the people of this country, and to the passions of some hon. Members of this House. He made a still further suggestion, which I say is unworthy a gentleman in his position; he made a revelation which should not have been made in this House, or out of it, affecting the guilt—if he be guilty—of one of the prisoners; a matter which we have heard to-night for the first time, and which was not produced upon the trial—it was a kind of special pleading of the right hon. Gentleman. And what is the nature of that revelation? It is that one of the prisoners for whom we pleaded addressed a letter to a man in America asking for bombs and money, and that these bombs and money were sent to him in like manner. Now, the man to whom the application

is said to have been made is dead, and the prisoner against whom the accusation is made is politically and civilly dead. The prisoner, therefore, has no opportunity of rebutting the charge, and it is unworthy of a Minister of the Crown to make an accusation of that kind when all possibility of proving, or disproving it is absent. Such conduct was mean; it was contemptible. He got rid of the case made by my hon. Friend the Member for Waterford without replying to it. He did not reply to my hon. Friend with regard to his assertion that the bombs that were found upon John Daly were planted upon him by Government spies and by Government agents, of whom these poor men were the victims. He made no reply to that. The right hon. Gentleman was accused of knowing the man who gave Daly this bomb, and again that part of the statement of my hon. Friend received no reply whatever. It is true the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the enormity of the crime; it is true that he expressed his horror of assassination; it is true that he read out a statement of the Judges. With regard to the enormity of the crime of outrage by the use of dynamite, we all agree with the opinion of that gentleman; but the right hon. Gentleman made no reply to the charge made against the Government by my hon. Friend. The right hon. Gentleman introduced the name of a man named Featherstone, upon whom was found some infernal machine, and he also said that Featherstone was associated in Cork with dynamite. The Government was doing the very same thing as had been done in the case of Daly. It is notorious that James McDermot, when he came from America and visited Ireland, was really in the pay of Dublin Castle; that he came down to Cork, and that he established the conspiracy with which Featherstone was proved to have had some connection; that that conspiracy was founded by some Government agent; so that most of these men are simply victims of Government agents. The right hon. Gentleman also endeavoured to rouse the feeling of this House by alluding to assassination. We will not allow the right hon. Gentleman

*Mr. Matthews*

to excel us in our abhorrence of assassination. We, in common with him, condemn—we have condemned it publicly, we have condemned it upon public platforms in the country, even in our own country—this policy of dynamite, which involves the innocent and the guilty alike in common slaughter. I would point out, with regard to the dynamite demonstrations in London, and with regard to those deeds for which some of them have been found guilty, that there was no assassination, and that there was no life lost. I may be told that these men were assassins at heart; I may be told that these men, handling a dangerous compound such as dynamite, had the intention of carrying out assassination. I say they must, having regard to the character of the explosive, have taken special precautions not to take life. I believe that the men who were engaged in the explosions must have used the dynamite in such a manner that it was more dangerous to themselves than to those amongst whom the explosions took place. The right hon. Gentleman concluded his speech with the entirely unnecessary task of showing the great enormity of the crime of causing such explosions; his whole speech was entirely unnecessary. There is not one of us who has not fixed ideas with regard to the enormity of the crime; but I hold that his speech is no reply to the hon. Member for Waterford. My hon. Friend put his case upon three grounds—first, that the offence was a political one, if they were guilty; secondly, that their convictions were wrongfully procured; and, thirdly, that their treatment was of a very exceptional character. With regard to the first, the right hon. Gentleman has admitted that the charge was of a political character; he has admitted it for the first time to-night. I have for years drawn attention to the manner of treatment of these prisoners, and of the especial severity that the officers, for some reason or other—I will not call it a pretext—exercise towards them; but never, during the whole course of the discussion, could I get the right hon. Gentleman to admit that the crime was in any way of a political character. He maintained at all times that it was a crime, but the right hon. Gentle-

man has now stated what he never before admitted, that it was a political offence. I think the right hon. Gentleman said that “it is a political offence, but it is none the less a crime.” I reply, it may be a crime, but it is none the less a political offence, and being political offenders they would receive special treatment, and be more leniently dealt with in every other country in the world except this country when dealing with Irish offenders. I may point out that in France, after the war of 1870, the Communists of Paris, who all but burned their city to the ground, had a malicious purpose, but they also had a political purpose; these men and women were transported across the sea for their offences; but after a few years, when political passions had subsided, these men, women, and children were every one emancipated, and allowed to return to their homes and kindred, and many of them have, since that time, become law-abiding citizens of their country, some of them filling positions no less honourable than those filled by right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Bench. Political offenders have been treated all the world over in a different manner to other offenders. Offences prompted by self-interest and self-aggrandisement have always been treated in a different manner to offences of a political character. I think I would be right in saying that if the Emperor of Russia could be sure that if he emancipated every Nihilist confined in Siberia, the agitation, of which these men and women formed a part, would cease, he would be glad to empty the prisons of Siberia; if he thought there would be an end to the agitation he would not hold these men and women in prison for the mere vindictive purpose of punishing them for their political offences. Every country to which I turn my eyes over Europe treats its political offenders in a different manner to other offenders; England alone has been slow to emancipate those who offend against her politically. Yet, even though England has been slow to extend pardon to her political offenders, she has from time to time allowed the feeling against her political offenders to drop. I doubt whether at the present moment there is



a worse feeling entertained towards the men in Chatham and Portland prisons than a former generation entertained towards the men of 1848 and 1867. The men of 1848 were some of them sentenced to be hanged; others were sent away into penal servitude, as also were the men of 1867; yet in the course of time, when the political events with which these men were connected had ceased to have any force, then England slowly relented, and gave the pardon to these political offenders which every civilized country in the world gave to men in the same position. The right hon. Gentleman for the first time in the course of this discussion admitted that the men for whom we are pleading here to-night committed offences that were tinged with a political character. I shall not dwell upon the wrongful manner in which their convictions were procured. My hon. Friend the Member for Waterford has dwelt upon the subject in a manner that I could not hope to emulate; he has described the position of the case with an ability and a forensic eloquence which I could not hope to arrive at. But he also made an appeal that the men whose cases we bring before the House to-night are entitled to have their cases investigated, and I will go further, and say that they are entitled to a release, by reason of the special treatment to which they have been subjected for the past eight or nine years. My hon. Friend spoke only of the manner in which they had been treated in Portland prison; but they were in other prisons before arriving at Portland. John Daly and others had been in Chatham, where they were specially sent in order that they might be specially punished, and they were specially punished because they were political offenders. There is scarcely any need to dwell upon the political character of their offences, except to show that it is not we alone who regarded them as political offenders, but the very men who were employed to inflict punishment upon them. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the Report of the Visiting Committee, which was put into the hands of hon. Members of this House, and for which I applied, and also the hon. Member

*Mr. John O'Connor*

for West Limerick, whose efforts on behalf of these men have been of a very patriotic character. This investigation into the treatment of these men was conducted by persons who were connected with the prison service itself. The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head, but it is a fact that these men were connected with the prison service, and the evidence taken by the Committee of visiting gentlemen was the evidence of those who were accused of having maltreated these men (hear, hear); and some of the evidence goes to show that they were especially badly treated. Henry J. Wilson says that the bitter hatred of the average Chatham officer towards political prisoners makes itself apparent in a thousand ways; in fact, the men were hounded down as Fenians, and as Fenians treated in an exceptional manner. Another of the prisoners is Egan, whose case has been singled out for exceptional treatment on an early occasion—Egan, who by the statement of the right hon. Gentleman to-night, is admitted to be suffering wrongfully, the man who is innocent of the charge. The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head, but he should recollect it had been stated that if Egan's case was investigated he might be released at an early day. The unfortunate position of these men is that right hon. Gentlemen upon both sides of the House are responsible for the injustice done. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was in office when they were convicted; was cognisant of everything, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bury was their prosecutor, and we all know that right hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House carried out their hereditary policy when dealing with political offenders in Ireland. They are all alike, and they conceive it to be a duty to themselves, instead of honestly admitting their error, to back up their error rather than release these men. What does Egan say, whose case has been specially singled out? He says that the officers employed would give him pieces of newspaper so as to get him punished. They have been specially singled out for specially bad treatment by the prison officials, and it is on that account, and I hold it is the strongest claim, that the

hon. Member for Waterford asked for an investigation into their cases—an investigation not like the last, by a Committee composed of prison officials. Some of those gentlemen had investigated the case before, and when another investigation was started, the very men we accused were put upon the Committee to sit in judgment upon themselves, so that nothing could have been more unfair. It is not that kind of an inquiry that we want, for if there is to be an inquiry into the charge we hope that neither the prosecutor nor the Home Secretary will form portions of that Committee. I have visited these men. I have seen them year after year and month after month fading away before my eyes, the strong and hearty young men that I knew at home becoming blanched with a premature old age. I have seen the strong, hearty This demand for details has a very men becoming decrepit and weak before my eyes, week after week and month after month, by these petty and shameful persecutions of petty officials who are engaged in carrying out the law in their regard. Will the House believe that these men, when they take their exercise in a hot sun in the summer time, are compelled to walk fast, while in the winter season, when it is cold, when they want to walk to circulate the blood, they are compelled to walk slowly. These statements have been proved, and can be found in the pages of this Report. In my experience of prisons, and my observation of the prisoners, I have seen men with the convict jackets on them allowed to stand at ease. Mr. Clayton, the Governor of Chatham prison, reprimanded the warders of Chatham prison for allowing these men to stand at ease. Let me give another instance of cruelty. Wilson complained to the doctor when he saw him, of being ill, and he was not allowed to see him (the doctor), when he requested to see him. Wilson requested to see the doctor. He was not allowed out on that and other occasions; but he became so ill that at last, in order to save his life, they allowed him to see the doctor, and then he complained to the doctor that he was not allowed to see him when he required, and of course he was re-

ported for having made such a statement; and, will the House believe it? Wilson got three days' bread and water for having complained to the doctor that he was not allowed to see him when he required. And when he then complained to the director of this he said—"The less complaints you make the better." The unfortunate prisoners who are thus persecuted by the warders have no friend but one, and that one the Protestant Chaplain of Chatham. The one kind word we find within the pages of that book that was spoken about these men was uttered by the Protestant Chaplain, and he said to the Visiting Committee—"They are well-conducted men, and were treated with unnecessary violence." It is not unnecessary rigour, it is not unnecessary treatment, but this Christian Minister says they were treated with unnecessary violence. And the other Christian Minister, of a Christian Government, stands up here and has nothing to do but to make accusations against men who are naturally and civilly dead, and make suggestions which are more worthy of a public prosecutor than of a respectable Minister of the Crown. It was stated by my hon. Friend, the Member for Waterford, that Daly was known to Members of this House. I say I am not ashamed to affirm in this House that Daly was an acquaintance of mine, and a friend of mine for many years. We grew up boys together, and a more honourable young man I would never wish to meet than the man whose case we are investigating here to-night; and I assert, from my knowledge of him, that he would be incapable of committing the crime for which he was charged and convicted. On the contrary, I know of my own knowledge that he was as strongly opposed to that policy as I was myself, and that is saying enough, because without having been called upon to do so, I have publicly denounced the policy of dynamite, and I never denounced it more strongly than John Daly would have done himself. It is true that John Daly was an extreme Nationalist, but if he was, he was an honourable man. He sought to separate the country by force of arms, but he would not stoop to any dishonourable act, even to win the inde-

pendence of his country—a cause which was most dear to his heart. From a close acquaintance with these men for years, I have made myself acquainted with the special treatment to which they have been subjected, and I hold that these being men of intelligence, of education, and of some culture, have suffered more for the past eight or ten years than common criminals could suffer in three lifetimes; that if you want vengeance you have had it in abundance; that your duty is to give these men their liberty, by reason of the fact that they have been excessively and exceptionally badly treated. Might I appeal to the Government? We have been told in the course of this discussion upon the reply to the most gracious Speech from the Throne, that this Session of Parliament is to be the last Session of the Parliament. The Government are about to appeal, sooner or later this year, to the country, and they will most likely appeal upon the success of their Irish policy. They have brought into this House, and passed into law, remedial measures for Ireland of such a character as will enable them to boast of their good intentions towards the people of Ireland; whether their measures have been sufficient or inadequate for the purpose it is not my purpose, nor am I called upon now to say. It is enough for me to admit that they will go with what they consider a strong hand to the country, and they will point to the remedial measures for Ireland. Would it be too much to ask them to make their Irish policy more perfect—to make it more complete by the release of these men for whom we plead to-night, rather than keep them in prison; not because justice demands it, but merely for the purpose of indulging in the vindictive spirit which is unworthy of an enlightened nation.

(9.20.) MR WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork County, N.E.): This is a subject on which there is no difference of opinion among Irish Nationalists. I appeal to the men on all sides of the House to pay some attention—to pay, I should say, respectful attention—to the unanimous and deeply-rooted feeling on this question among the whole people of Ireland. But really it is not a matter of contentious debate about this or that; it is a question of humanity and

*Mr. John O'Connor*

of the broad national policy. The facts in the Daly and Egan case stand further apart from the rest, and I do not propose to weary the House by going again over the ground traversed by hon. Members, but I would respectfully submit to any dispassionate man that it is almost impossible to examine the evidence and the statement of the Chief Constable, Mr. Farndale, without to say the very least, a feeling of uneasiness as to the conviction of John Daly, and without a feeling that everything has not been done to clear up the story—that shocking statement which is made deliberately by one of the chief officers of the police. If that story of these bombs having been planted on John Daly by an agent of the police was invented by Mr. Farndale, he ought long ago to have been dismissed and punished. On the other hand, if that story is well founded—I go further, and say if there is a colour of suspicion that would account for the impression which was, and which remains, upon Mr. Farndale's mind—then I say better ten thousand times that John Daly, even if guilty, should go free than that the public mind should rest under the horrible suspicion that his conviction was brought about by such means as this. The moral of this question is—and I must say the case has not been yet dealt with—the question is, who was the person who gave these bombs to Daly, and brought him to Liverpool for the purpose of receiving them? Was he a police agent? The Government know who he was. I venture to say that until we have the whole story out, who this man was, as to how he slipped through the fingers of the police, and as to where he is now, and as to how it happened that the police came to be at that particular spot in readiness at the very moment when Daly had the parcel in his possession—I venture to say you will never satisfy the public mind that Mr. Farndale was under a mere delusion when he solemnly made this shocking statement, that the whole thing was a contrivance of the police for the purpose of getting into their toils a man whom, no doubt, they had reason to suspect had been engaged in treasonable practices of another sort. It seems to me that

the weakness of the Home Secretary's investigation, which no doubt was a *bona fide* one, was this: Did his investigation extend to the Irish police? because it is the Irish police, not the English police, that are implicated by Mr. Farndale's statement. I agree at once, and I am sure that no Home Secretary would be capable of employing an *agent provocateur* of this character; but it is notorious that subordinates of his in Ireland are capable of doing such things. I should be very sorry indeed to make up needlessly a state of things that I hope has passed away or ever; but I am sorry to say that I have only too many materials for remembering this subject. I shall only mention one fact. It is notorious that the man who was at the head of the Irish Constabulary Detective Department at that time was a man of the most infamous character. It is notorious that this man, the head of the Detective Department in Ireland in these very years, organised at least more than one of those "plants," so to say, of precisely the same character as Mr. Farndale has mentioned in the case of Daly. He employed one man—Noonan, I believe, was his name—as an agent of the police, and from that man's lips I took down the confession that the head of the detective force in Ireland employed him to get up a bogus plot against the life of one of the Irish Judges, in which he was to endeavour to implicate, if possible, a Member of this House, the hon. Member for South Tipperary, who is after speaking this moment. That is not a single case. We all unhappily remember the case of James Macdermott. We know beyond all question that this man Macdermott was visiting Mr. Jenkinson in Dublin Castle at the very time that he was organising a dynamite conspiracy in Cork. We know that Macdermott escaped, as this man escaped from Liverpool, and his unfortunate victims found their way to penal servitude. I remember well the case of Mr. P. L. Fitzgerald, of Cork, who was acquitted by a Crimes Act jury, and the jury were so shocked by the methods employed in that case that they actually added a rider to their verdict condemning the

methods that had been taken to implicate Mr. Fitzgerald in a murder conspiracy. These things it is most painful to us to recall, but they are matters that are notorious in Ireland, unhappily. And when we know that Mr. Farndale's statement, the statement of an influential police officer in England, corresponds exactly with our own experience of what happened in similar cases in Ireland; and when we know, as I must say, like the hon. Member who has just spoken, as I do know from my own knowledge, that John Daly was a man of integrity, a man of singular ability, a man who was an honest and consistent opponent of Parliamentary agitation, but who had undoubtedly an honest abhorrence of crime on his character, and who had, I may say, the most chivalrous ideas of fighting England in the open—when the Irish people have all these facts before them, what can they conclude in this case, except that this unfortunate fellow, who was no doubt a Fenian, who was proud to be a Fenian, was not convicted as a dynamitard, but for all we know, and certainly until we have heard much more about it, he was the victim of some nefarious proceeding on the part of some police officer. I do hope the hour has at last arrived for reconsidering Egan's case after eight years of frightful torture in an English prison. He was convicted of a crime of which he is as innocent as any man in this House. At one time he was a believer in physical force as the only method for the redress of Irish grievances. Thousands and tens of thousands of men are walking free in Ireland to-day who were participators in a crime for which I am not ashamed to confess myself on a very humble scale a participator. Sir, there is here a much broader question than whether there has been a possible miscarriage of justice in two or three cases. I do not deny that in a number of those cases the prisoners were rightly convicted, and of a dreadful crime; and I think there can be no doubt either that if there was any substantial danger of the renewal of this system of dynamite conspiracies, it would be unreasonable and unjust to extend mistaken leniency to men capable of making war with such

weapons. But all the world knows the circumstances under which these dynamite conspiracies originated—the desperation and hopelessness of other remedies. All the world knows that they are passed away and gone as utterly as the wrongs of the terrible penal laws. We have been reminded by the Home Secretary to-night of some circumstances to the contrary. We have found in some countries a lunatic who will resort to dynamite or something of that sort for the purpose of public or of private vengeance. But that is a wholly different thing. The police may be thoroughly trusted to deal with lunacy of that sort, and there is not the slightest hope of any section of the Irish people sympathising with them. It is inevitable and natural that the Irish people should remember that the motives of these men were not selfish. Their offences were committed at a time of desperation and bitterness, and although the explosions they organised were most reckless and criminal, they manifestly were not planned with any intention of destroying human life, but, on the contrary, were intended to create as much alarm as possible without destroying human life. Compared with the frightful bloodshed and blowing up of public buildings under the Commune in Paris, what are the offences of these men? And yet the men convicted under the Commune have been amnestied, and the effect has been to extinguish all danger of anything like revolutionary feeling. I do not mean to extenuate the offences that were committed, they were horrible offences, but I do say the public danger is completely passed, and these men have expiated their offences by many long years of penal servitude. A feeling of trust is growing up between the two countries, and its continuance depends upon the readiness to grant frank amnesty for all things past, without measuring too nicely the feeling whether enough has been done to satisfy public justice. The Irish people do not want to make political capital out of this matter, they desire to see these unfortunate men restored to liberty while life remains in them at all, and would respectfully impress upon the Home Secretary, and upon men on both sides of the House, that in

*Mr. William O'Brien*

yielding to the earnest desire of the Irish people, they will be doing more than anything else to remove unpleasant memories, and to knit the two nations together, and to make these wretched crimes impossible for the future.

(9.45). MR. EDMUND LEAMY (South Sligo): The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary said he acknowledged the sympathy existing in Ireland with Daly and with his fellow prisoners, and he said he deplored that feeling. If, during the short time the right hon. Gentleman represented an Irish constituency, he had learned anything at all he would be prepared to know that the speech he has delivered to-night has intensified the feeling of sympathy with this man. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that if the Irish people knew as much as he does about these men they would not have the same feelings they now have. Some of the Irish people respected and honoured them. It is not so long ago since public feeling became sympathetically aroused in England on behalf of a woman convicted of husband-poisoning. She had a perfectly fair trial and was sentenced to death. Why was she not executed? If properly tried and convicted the Home Secretary had no right to yield to public clamour and mitigate that sentence merely to meet the public demands and the sympathy of the man in the street. The Irish prisoners were arrested in a time of panic and of fear, hostile to anything done by Irishmen against England. No doubt, though the jury that tried them were desirous of doing justice, they must have gone into the box with strong feeling against the dynamitards, so that the prisoners had to face a tribunal that was insensibly prejudiced against them. The next point is that the Chief Constable at Birmingham, and some of his subordinates declared that these bombs were put upon John Daly by some of the agents of the Irish police. Does the right hon. Gentleman believe that the Chief Constable at Birmingham, Mr. Farndale, made that statement believing it to be untrue; does he know that Mr. Farndale is still the Chief Constable in Birmingham, enjoying the confidence of the people there? Sir, that circumstance goes far to explain

he feelings of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman says there is good ground for re-considering the case of Egan, but how long is it to be before the case is re-considered? The right hon. Gentleman refused to go into the prison treatment of these men, but it is admitted that they were put in special cells where they were confined 16 hours every day deprived even of the light coming from heaven—shut out from the light of the sun—and I would ask whether it is right in this 19th century that men should be confined in a cell from which God's light is excluded. Then there is another matter. My hon. friend the Member for Waterford invited the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that Daly on three occasions was poisoned and actually brought to the door of death. I want to ask any hon. Gentleman whether he does not think that some consideration should be shown to Daly on that account. This is torture, and some compensation should be made; we suggest that his sentence of penal servitude should be shortened. It has been over and over again declared by Ministers from these Benches that it was only by outrage that the Irish people obtained any recognition of their rights, and if Irishmen join in these outrages they have a fine defence in the speeches of many Ministers in this House and elsewhere. We are told to bury the hatchet, to abandon old memories, but I should like to see some reciprocity; I should like to see you begin. You may sneer at the sympathy of the Irish people for these men. You do not understand the Irish people. We are a race distinct and apart from you. Though you have robbed us of the outward show of our nationhood, we are a distinct nation; and I tell you that if you sneer at the sympathies of our people, or stand up in your lofty superior way, as the right hon. Gentleman has done to-night, to despise the sympathy they extend to their countrymen, who have risked and suffered for them, who have laid down their lives, even though the project in which they have been engaged may have been mad and insensate projects, to better their country, I tell you you are going a bad way to secure that peace and harmony between this

country and Ireland which you profess to desire.

\*(10.2.) MR. C. DARLING (Deptford): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it were possible to use an argument utterly maladroitness and unfit to gain the sympathy of this House, I should say that it would be the use of such an argument as that which has been used by the hon. Member who has just sat down. To say that because the Irish are a separate race, with different views of treason, with different views of felony, with different views of right and wrong—[Cries of "No!"]—Yes—to say that when they commit a crime they should not be punished for it, when if it were committed by an Englishman he would be punished for it, is to use an argument which the English people do not understand. But there was another argument—the argument that we are bound to release people who have been guilty of outrage, of the making of bombs, of the firing of bombs, because years ago in England there were men who sympathised with Orsini; and that there were, or are still, in London, men who carry on the manufacture of bombs. I cannot understand or sympathise with that argument for a moment. That people sympathised with Orsini or others who they thought were oppressed. I can understand, and they got as much sympathy as they deserved. There were people in England who thought that the Emperor of the French, who certainly had not treated them badly, ought to have done something more for them; and those people, when they found an attack made by an Italian on the Emperor of the French, may have sympathised and gone on sympathising with men like Orsini. I do not know who they were. It certainly was not me, because I have no personal recollections of the doings of Orsini. I have only read of them. But if there were people who sympathised with him and his attempt, can it be assumed that because they did so we should sympathise with people who have done as bad as and worse than Orsini did. Now I should imagine that if there were anything at all in this appeal, which is made by hon. Members from Ireland, or by the hon. Member who had just sat down and who sug-

gested that this was the best way to unite the people of England and Ireland, then there should have been more than one member of the Front Opposition Bench present to hear it. Where are those who, if this Government left office to-morrow, would come in and seek the release of these men. They are not here. (Cheers.) They take apparently the same view as Her Majesty's ministers, but they do not quite so boldly express it on this occasion. Yet they have done so. It has been said to-night that some of these men have undoubtedly been guilty; yet these men are to be released equally with the others—men who have been admittedly guilty of the worst of outrages—the use of dynamite in the prosecution of treasonable practices. It was said that they had been careful not to hurt any people—only buildings. I do not know that they were so careful; but whether they were or not, they have been convicted under a somewhat weak-minded Act of treasonable practices instead of treason. If they had been convicted of treason we should not have been subjected to the Debate to-night and that one of last year—

An hon. MEMBER: Much more merciful.

MR. DARLING: Well then I regret that course has not been adopted, if it would have been more merciful. It is said these men have been in prison for nine years. Well, many men in England, and Ireland too, have been imprisoned for nine, and for nine and twenty, years. Are they to be released? You cannot commit a worse offence I should imagine than treason.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. DARLING: Well, not a worse offence than treason aided by dynamite. Some hon. Members seem to think that treason is a somewhat venial offence. To my mind it is the worst of offences, and the person who is guilty of it deserves the severest punishment. These people have been convicted of acts which amount to treason, and treason carried into effect by the most brutal and the most inhuman of methods. These people have been in gaol eight or nine years, and we are told that for them eight or nine years is sufficient, and more than sufficient.

*Mr. C. Darling*

Now, if we are to agree to that we must at the same time agree that eight or nine years is sufficient, or more than sufficient, for every conceivable offence. We ought, therefore, not only to let out these prisoners, but everybody who has served eight or nine years' penal servitude, because no one can be in prison at this moment for a worse offence than that of which those men were convicted, that is presuming them to be guilty. I cannot see, therefore, that there is any logical reason for letting those people out more than for letting out any other malefactors. I am told, however, that these men had no sordid motive or object; that they had a political object. It may be so; but it has long been conceded that treason is the highest crime known to the law. It was also said that we should let them out because it would be personally gratifying to certain persons. All I can say is that we should not let them out upon that score. I can well understand the solicitude of hon. Members of both the Irish Parties opposite. I can well imagine that a number of votes depend on the due and warm advocacy of the case of these prisoners, and full justice has been done to it. Everybody knows that they will not be released; but the speeches have been made, and their friends will be grateful and will show it in the proper way. The hon. Member said—suppose Egan, Larrigan, and O'Brien had escaped to America—happily they had not the chance of doing so—and we had asked the Americans to hand them back as guilty of murder, would the Americans have done it? Who knows? Perhaps they would. The hon. Member said they would not. Well, it might have depended on the weight of the Irish vote in the Presidential elections. It would not have depended on the abstract question of whether those men were guilty of murder. It would have been decided with a view to electioneering prospects and nothing else. At all events, I think it would. The hon. Member, who knows America better perhaps than I do, perhaps thinks the same thing, but does not like to say it. There is a distinction drawn between the case of some of the prisoners and that of others. It is said that Whitehead, Gallagher,

and others were not so guilty as the rest, and should be released, and that Daly and Egan were improperly convicted and should be released. But this House has already considered the question. Those who have taken the trouble to read the evidence in the case of Daly have been good enough to give us on former occasions their opinions as to the guilt or innocence of this man Daly, who, we are now assured, is an innocent man. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir W. Harcourt) was present when this question was raised last year, and he then gave it as his opinion that Daly was guilty. He had looked through all the evidence. He gave the House the benefit of his opinion upon it, and he pointed out that all this story on which we are asked to believe that Daly was convicted by error was never alleged by Daly himself, but apparently was invented for him by someone of more inventive imagination than himself. About that story of an *agent provocateur* the right hon. Member for Derby used these words—

"But that is not all. Ever since that time, although he has had every opportunity of making that statement, he has never done so. The statement referred, not to an *agent provocateur*, but to an informer. It showed that he suspected there was an informer who had told the Government what sort of transactions he was engaged in."

Next comes the commonest of old excuses. Long before I had the honour of a seat in this House I was familiar with the excuses of prisoners at the bar who were found in possession of compromising articles. They invariably said that they had been given to them by a friend, who asked them to take care of them for a short time. I have on their behalf alleged that reason, sometimes with success and sometimes without it, but I never could hope to allege it with success to an audience half so intelligent as hon. Gentlemen on the Benches opposite. But besides the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, the hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire (Mr. Haldane) spoke last year in this debate. He spoke as a friend. He said he hoped that Government would release some of these prisoners, and the reason he hoped they would release more than one of these

prisoners was that they were men highly regarded in Fenian circles who longed for their return. The hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire said—

"I think it is much to be regretted that much of the debate has been wide of the amendment which simply recommends a policy of clemency. Reasons have been urged which have gone for the most part to the righteousness of the conviction. On that part of the case I do not entertain much doubt. I listened carefully to the arguments advanced with a view to impugn the finding of the jury in the case of Daly and Egan, and it seemed to me that the answer of the Home Secretary was conclusive."

Now we have the same arguments again. The Home Secretary has satisfied the hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire that Daly is guilty. We are asked again to believe that Daly is the victim of some nefarious plot on the part of the police. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby does not believe it. The hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire does not believe it. I do not know who does believe it. Daly does not believe it. Daly has never said it. Never. He has been interviewed more than once. But is it ground for releasing him that he is what he has never said he is? At the best these men are traitors and deserve a traitor's fate. It is said that they have had enough, too much, when, after having been engaged in a plot to blow up and ruin not only the buildings, but perhaps also the people of this country, they have been in prison for nine years. There are persons who have been convicted of perjury, or some assault, or embezzlement, and sent to penal servitude, and all these people are to remain in the same gaol from which these men are to be liberated because in addition to being dynamitards, and liable to be prosecuted for having dynamite in their possession and dealing with it, they are traitors, and because they are entitled to claim a peculiar clemency from the nation. Has a case been made out? I do not think so any more than the Front Opposition Bench think so. At all events, a claim is advanced on grounds which make it impossible to grant it. It is advanced with regard to the worst of them. Those who have most carefully in-



vestigated the case including the present and the last Home Secretaries, and the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Haldane) have come to the conclusion that there was no miscarriage of justice, and that the verdicts of the jury were right. By those verdicts we must, I imagine, stand. This House cannot reverse them. It cannot reverse them in deference to the opinion that they were wrong, nor I imagine can it reverse them simply on the ground of clemency, nor because the hon. Member for Cork said there was no danger, as dynamite outrages have ceased. I see in that an additional reason for keeping them in. If you are wise, detain them where they are while dynamite outrages do not go on.

10.21. MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): The hon. and learned Member for Deptford has stated that this Motion has been brought forward on this side in order to catch votes. If so, I wonder for what purpose his speech was made. He says we brought forward this Motion knowing it was hopeless, and that it was certain to be refused. If our Motion was brought forward with the object of gaining votes, at any rate, in its essence, our attitude is more respectable in suing for mercy and clemency for those men than is his speech, which was an unnecessary speech, refusal having already been given, and a speech only made for the purpose of attracting the votes of certain Conservatives in his own Constituency. The speech to which we have just listened almost makes a man understand a dynamitard. If there were anything calculated to drive a man into rebellion it is the notion that he was being ruled by 670 gentlemen like the hon. Member for Deptford. And when I reflect that it is by votes and recommendations and decisions of a number of gentlemen like the Member for Deptford that our country is ruled, and that speeches like his will be telegraphed to America, insulting, as they do, our nation in that country, and, not only our nation, but the President and Senate and Congress of the United States and its Ambassadors, I really wonder that you have not further crops of incendiaries in that Republic. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Deptford,

*Mr. Darling*

fortunately for himself, was never Member for Dungarvan. He has no past to apologise for. I think I do remember a speech made for amnesty by the Member for Dungarvan. When we are asked here to explain how it is that there are masses of men in Ireland who sympathise with some of these men who are in prison, we can remember the great defence which was made for poor O'Donovan Rossa on the hustings of the old fishing village when it was declared that O'Donovan Rossa and Thomas Clarkson embodied the passion for liberty of the Irish race. I attribute the courtesy exhibited by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to an unconscious cerebration or some political transfusion which enabled him while still Home Secretary of this great Empire to remember the days when he addressed the humble fishermen at Dungarvan. The Home Secretary has made a speech which in its tone and temper differed widely from the speech of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. But I am bound to say that I think it was lacking in two or three points. Of course we draw a wide distinction so far as our own view is concerned between the cases which have been brought forward and the cases of men as to whose trial no question has been raised; and it must necessarily be admitted that their position stands on a different footing from that of others. But the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary has stated that as regards Daly he had himself seen the Chief Constable of Birmingham. But he did not say anything on a point as to which I think we are entitled to an answer. If he expects to convince us, I ask him if he convinced the Chief Constable of Birmingham, and if he did not succeed, and he did not pretend that he did, in driving out of the mind of Mr. Farndale the haunting suspicion which lurked therein, what hope have you of driving out of our minds the notion that there was some unfair play? I imagine the right hon. Gentleman having his conference with the Chief Constable and saying to him: "I will now lay before you all the documents in my possession in the Home Office, and having them before you I will ask you to withdraw and retract this unfortunate document you

have sent." But the right hon. Gentleman with all the information at his disposal did not succeed in vacating Mr. Farndale's mind of the remarkable impressions which existed there, and so far as the Irish people are concerned, and I say so far as the English people are concerned, all we know is that the chief officer of the Birmingham police, charged with the duty of tracking down offenders has stated that the whole of this business so far as Daly was concerned was, and never could be anything but a plant and a trick. But the Home Secretary did one thing to-night which I conceive to be unfair. We know the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bury (Sir H. James) conducted these prosecutions. We know further more his high character in this House and the fairness with which he has always addressed himself to this question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bury did not state to the jury anything in connection with Daly and Breslin about dynamite shells being thrown from the gallery of this House. After there has been eight years' expiation of their offences, the Home Secretary draws out of his pocket a document, saying, "I have here a letter from Daly to Breslin with these terrible suggestions." If the right hon. Gentleman was in possession of that document, why did not the right hon. Member for Bury present it to the jury at the trial? Where did this letter come from? We have heard of the letters of a gentleman named Pigott, and when eight years afterwards a document of this kind is relied upon in this House, I say it must be tainted at the source, and the mere fact that it was not used by a gentleman like the right hon. Member for Bury in his grave duties as prosecutor in a grave case like this damns that document in the judgment of every honest man. We are entitled to say that the case against Daly is an extremely weak one, if the right hon. Gentleman is driven to fall back on a document not produced at the trial, and containing allegations so crushing as are now suggested. If it is in the handwriting of Daly, surely it would have been easy to have proved it. I think it was unfair and regrettable, rather, I think, due to a slip,

that the Home Secretary trotted out the document before us to-night, for he has used it in regard to a man whose mouth is closed and his hands bound; and, under these circumstances, some Member of the Government should take the opportunity of clearing the letter away, or explaining why it was not used before. I read a letter in the *Times* the other day, in which an eminent English lawyer, after complimenting the right hon. Member for Bury on the conduct of the trials, said that whatever question existed in his mind with regard to Daly, there would be none with regard to Egan. John Daly must be a man of more than common mould, who, after all the tortures he underwent, the horrible dress, and the cheerless and inhospitable character of the place in which they were, when believing himself dying from doses of poison, had no thought but of his fellow-prisoner; all he wanted was to secure the liberation and redress of his fellow-prisoner. Two or three years ago the Report of the Prison Visitors was placed before the House, and in that were Daly's statements, reading which any man must have some feeling of doubt in regard to the case. Believing he was dying, he asked to be allowed to see Egan to ask his forgiveness for the great wrong he had done him; to say that he had no more share in his confidence than a child unborn, and never knew his political opinions. And then he gave further reasons to show the innocence of Egan. I think that even British justice might take facts of that kind into its ken; and that when a large body of Irish opinion comes to the House of Commons with a plea for these men, it should be met in a better spirit than was shown by the hon. Gentleman to-night. The right hon. Gentleman says he sees some chance of perhaps at some future time doing something in regard to the case. I ask the right hon. Member for Bury whether he, from his great forensic position, and as one of the most confidential supporters of the Government, does not think that now, after eight years of terrible slavery, something might not be done, at any rate, as regards Egan's case. With regard to him, the one you call the principal offender says, that he had no share

or part in his offences. After these eight years it would not be unbecoming to the right hon. Member for Bury if he could see his way to intervene—aye, even to intercede, and do something to open still more the mind of the Home Secretary. I fully sympathise with the hon. Member for Waterford in regard to bringing forward anything in respect to prison treatment. We were to a certain extent enjoying the hospitality of the Home Secretary when we saw these men in their cells, and it would not be becoming in the hon. Member for Waterford or myself to say anything as to what we heard or saw of the prison treatment, but I may say that I think the entire treatment of prisoners of this class is not worthy of a great country. What advantage have you in treating your worst enemies, politically speaking, in the same way as you treat burglars and thieves? John Mitchell was convicted of treason felony and sentenced to the same term as Egan, in 1848, and it will be remembered that complaint was made that when he was going out to Bermuda on a man-of-war he messed with the officers, but a minute was sent out by the Government approving of his treatment. Is not the year 1892 more advanced in charity and civilization, even British civilization, than the year 1848? Yet in 1848, when this Act was brand new, passed in a panic, you allowed the Mitchells, the Martins, and others to be treated as gentlemen, and to sit side by side with officers holding Her Majesty's commission. When the First Lord of the Treasury was Chief Secretary for Ireland he had to give way on the question of prison treatment, and allow prisoners of a certain class to retain their own dress. Many of these men are being driven insane. This Blue Book deals with the case of the man Flanagan, and the report must make it obvious to every man that he was at that moment almost a lunatic. What have you done since that to relieve his distress? You have kept him quarrying and picking oakum. It is the duty of the officials to prevent malingering, but in such a case as this there should be presented year after year doctors' reports on the condition of the men. The report was made in March, 1890, and evidently the investi-

gation took place in 1889; the kind of incoherent replies he gave to the visitors will be found on page 7. Several times he says:

"I have power to show great signs and wonders in the earth by shutting up the organs of my body."

I have called attention to this case for two or three years, but, as far as I can make out Flanagan is undergoing exactly the same treatment as he was then. We are entitled to say that the offences most of these men have committed have been due to a desire to carry out political changes by misconceived means; and you cannot be expected to look at their offences in the same way that we do; but we are entitled to say that, if they have been sentenced to penal servitude, they are not sentenced to be poisoned, or to insanity. We are entitled to ask that doctors' reports shall be made annually with regard to these men, who are more liable to harsh treatment than any others in Her Majesty's prisons. You may say this is an exceptional course. Exactly; these are exceptional cases. We are entitled to have reports during the time they are in custody, be that time long or short, and the House may expect to hear of them again and again. It was only the other day I received a statutory declaration from a man who was in constant political association with Daly up to the year of his arrest, and that states that Daly was constantly protesting his horror of the dynamite and similar movements. Where there is conflicting testimony I prefer to believe my own countrymen, the testimony of Daly's friends to that of his enemies, and we shall, in and out of season, support any movement to alleviate his lot, and to secure his speedy release from prison.

\*(10.55.) SIR JOSEPH MCKENNA (Monaghan, S.): We are all familiar with the defences usually set up by the Home Secretary for the time being, when an allegation of a miscarriage of justice is made in this House. I shall refer to one case only. When that of Kilmartin, who was subsequently liberated, was originally raised in the time of a predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman, I ventured to give my firm opinion that he was innocent of the crime with which he was charged, and

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

of which he had been found guilty. The case was nearly on all fours with that of Egan. It was shortly this: a man, who was dying in the United States, told the priest who attended him on the occasion that there was a man in prison named Kilmartin convicted of the attempt to murder a man in the West of Ireland, but that it was he, and not Kilmartin, who made the attempt, and that Kilmartin was innocent. The only difference in the two cases was that Daly, when he exonerated Egan, only believed himself to be dying; whilst in Kilmartin's case the man who confessed did actually die. The priest to whom the statement was made by the dying man, not under the seal of the confessional, communicated with the friends of Kilmartin, and the matter was brought to the notice of the Home Secretary; but it was not until the debate became personal that further inquiry was granted into the matter. It then reached the right hon. Gentleman's sensorium that it was a real miscarriage of justice. With regard to Daly, I know a great deal; I also know a great deal of the opinions of the late Isaac Butt about him. They were great friends, but Butt was incensed in a certain way against Daly, whom, however, he believed to be as high-minded a man as he ever knew. Mr. Butt, no doubt, further said that Daly would, in one sense, be a curse if he joined the party, and he was glad that he had not joined us. This question involved in the cases of Daly and Egan should be treated in a different spirit to that shown by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary. We know that special cases have to be treated in a special manner; if the whole country is agitated, as we know it is, over the cases of these men, I think the best policy that the Government could now adopt would be to say that these men have been subjected to a large amount of punishment already, and that, having regard to all the circumstances, their cases would be taken into consideration with a view to the liberation of as many as they possibly could. The people of Ireland are susceptible of gratitude, and that, I should say, would be the best policy to pursue. I believe Daly to be quite

innocent of the crime with which he was charged; at all events, so far as the use of dynamite was concerned. I believe, also, there has been no answer given to the case made out by Mr. Farndale; and unless the Government are prepared to answer it, they must rest under a degree of suspicion that they are holding back something that ought to be known.

(11.4.) MR. J. G. SWIFT MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I think it is very clear that a miscarriage of justice has occurred in various cases, and mainly in the case of Egan; but hon. Gentlemen upon both sides of the House need not be surprised that a charge of miscarriage of justice has been made, for hon. Gentlemen should recollect that this is not the first time that justice has miscarried in England. I will mention one case, and I think it ought to be a warning to both sides of the House—I mean the case in Manchester, when O'Brien and Larkin were sentenced to death. Four men were sentenced to death, the Judge seeing no difference between the case of the fourth man and that of the other three. The reporters who had heard the evidence came to the conclusion that the fourth man was not guilty, and they addressed a strong remonstrance in reference to it, with the result that the case of the fourth man was re-considered, and he was reprieved. The fourth man was convicted not upon evidence, but from prejudice, and in the height of political passion, and I believe the same may be said of Daly, who undoubtedly was prejudiced from his former connection with Fenianism. Having regard to the circumstances under which Daly was convicted, I think a very strong case has been made out in his behalf, for it cannot be doubted that great prejudice existed against him at the time of his conviction. Having regard to the fact that a period of eight years has elapsed, and recollecting that the theory of the law is that punishment is only imposed as a preventative, I do not see why clemency should not be exercised towards these men. Hon. Gentlemen have spoken of the Fenian movement, but the Fenians were men who were capable of making great sacrifices, and even the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary him-

self at one time was not ashamed to avail himself of the influence of Fenianism. Does the right hon. Gentleman recollect Dungarvan? (Cheers.) He does; well, and this is how the *Times*, in a leader, on the 21st November, 1868, speaks of his return—

"Mr. Henry Matthews is returned for Dungarvan, and is ranked as a Liberal, but as his Liberalism is apparently the result of a cross between Toryism and Fenianism, and is not inconsistent with a general denunciation of all Liberal statesmen, his vote is not altogether certain. His opponent, Mr. Serjeant Barry, a Liberal, had, it appears, in the course of his duty as a barrister, committed the crime of holding a brief against a Fenian prisoner; and Mr. Matthews, who is, we believe, an Englishman, availed himself of the discontent of the disaffected portion of the constituency with this act to turn Mr. Serjeant Barry out of his seat." (Cheers.)

That appeared in a *Times* leader upon 21st November, 1868. I think, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman, having regard to old associations—(laughter)—might liberate these men; he might very well liberate Daly now. Recollect that Daly could very easily have escaped further punishment if he liked. He was visited in prison by Pigott and by Mr. Soames; and if he had yielded to the temptation to join with them in blackening the character of Irish Members, he might have been free and in as good a position as some of his prosecutors. He was tempted to commit perjury and to purchase his liberty at the expense of the characters of the Irish Members, for on the 28th March, 1888, the Secretary of State for the Home Department said—

"Richard Pigott got permission to visit John Daly at Chatham Prison on the 12th November, 1888; he paid the visit on the 3rd December, 1888, in the presence of Major Capel, the Deputy Governor. Daly had been previously visited on the 21st October by Mr. Soames."

I may say that Soames got permission to see Daly for the purposes of the Parnell Commission, and that Pigott got permission for the same purpose. The interview took place in secret, and the man who resisted such temptation and accepted in preference to go to penal servitude is not likely to be guilty of the foul offence of outrage. Revolutionists of that kind are men filled with great enthusiasm and are not likely to condescend to petty artifices. The House has heard with

astonishment a statement made by the hon. Member for North-East Cork in reference to the organised perjury and conspiracy by which Daly was convicted. A letter was read from Mr. John Ellis Trench to the effect that the Government had a very narrow escape; the phrase used, I believe, was "We sail very close to the wind," and I should like to know if that was in reference to the bombs that had been placed in Egan's garden by some other person?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Daly admitted that he put them there himself.

Mr. MAC NEILL: Daly's statement was that he put them there to conceal them, and that they had been put by some trick into his possession.

Mr. MATTHEWS: No, no; nothing of the sort. Daly simply said that he put them there himself.

Mr. MAC NEILL: Well, I make the statement upon what information I have before me, and I understand that Daly distinctly told the jury so. Now, the head of the detective department at Birmingham, who could have no personal or political purpose to serve, has come to the conclusion that Daly was innocent, and when such a man comes to that conclusion, I ask how can a prisoner be kept in any longer? It is not likely that he who refuses to commit perjury would condescend to any subterfuge in reference to dynamite. The *Times*, and the Government which connected itself with the *Times*, thought that Daly was a terrible witness to produce at the Commission. I do not think that there is any reason whatever for keeping this man, who has already expiated any offence he may have committed, in prison any longer, and I hope that the clemency of the Crown will be exercised in regard to him. I hope and trust that the Government will see their way to meet the unanimous desire of the Irish people in this matter, a desire which is generally entertained. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman has had any experience of penal servitude, but everyone who has gone through a prison must know that penal servitude is worse than death, and I believe if hon. Members below the Gangway would put more pressure upon the Home Secretary this very reasonable appeal would be yielded to at once.

Mr. J. G. Swift Mac Neill

\***MR. MARTIN FLAVIN (Cork):** Being a new Member, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House until I acquire some experience, but, having listened carefully to the hon. Members who have preceded me, and to the Home Secretary, I feel bound, in the interests of humanity, if for no other reason, to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford. I should like to reply to one observation of the hon. Member for Deptford, who, I believe, is not now in the House. (An hon. MEMBER: Yes.) He has said that this action is taken for the purpose of obtaining votes. I, as a new Member, repudiate that. My action in this matter, and I hope the action of my brother Members, is actuated by higher motives than to gain votes. I have no sympathy whatever with dynamitards. I have no sympathy with crime of any kind; but I have considerable sympathy, from what I have heard to-night, with the unfortunate men who have suffered so much in prison. The hon. and learned Member for Deptford spoke as if trial by jury were infallible. It is well-known that in many political cases in Ireland, chiefly in times of panic, innocent persons have been punished. It was only the other day I accidentally came across a newspaper account of a conviction of two men, which has been already referred to in this House—an account of a conviction in 1879 on a charge of burglary and attempt to murder. These men were released in 1888, when it was proved to demonstration that they were innocent. That being so, I hold that trial by jury is not, at all events, infallible. I referred to the fact that in times of political excitement, juries may be carried away by their feelings. The hon. and learned Member for Deptford, and I think the hon. Member for Donegal, referred to the case of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien, and the hon. Member for Donegal said that there were four men found guilty of murder. The hon. Member for Deptford said that three were tried for murder. With all respect to the hon. Members, I believe I am correct in saying that I am as conversant with these events as they are. There were five men put upon their trial: three

were convicted and executed; the two others were liberated immediately after conviction. In that trial two were liberated and three were executed. I knew one of the three—O'Brien; and if I believed him to be a murderer, I would not, as a Member of this House, refer to the fact that I was acquainted with him; but I do so, not with shame, but with pride, for a finer specimen of an Irishman I never knew; and although I may not be able to convince the House that that man was innocent of the crime for which he was executed, I am myself convinced of the fact. I myself regretted at the time that life was taken, but I do firmly believe that that life was taken not designedly, but through misadventure. Under these circumstances, I think it not at all unreasonable that this House should consent to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford, which is not for the release of these men, but that their case should be reconsidered, and if found desirable that they should be leniently treated. I have to thank the House for the kindness with which they have heard me.

(11.26.) **MR. W. H. K. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.):** It has been said more than once in this Debate that a considerable feeling had been raised throughout the length and breadth of Ireland at the continued imprisonment of these men, Mr. Daly, Egan, and the other persons convicted. One hon. Member, the hon. Member for Deptford, said that if these men were Englishmen their cases would not be reconsidered. If they were Englishmen a very considerable amount of consideration would be given to their case. If there were 16 Englishmen in prison in this country whose case had by great demonstration been brought to the notice of the public, I am quite certain a great amount of consideration would be paid to the matter. Some of the largest and most influential gatherings that have taken place in Ireland during recent years have occurred during the last 12 months with the object of calling the attention of the House and of the Government to this important matter. This is not a question that has attracted the attention of one or two Members of Parliament; it is a question which is forced

upon the attention of the House by the people of Ireland, and it is a question which will continue to be agitated, listened to or not. Reference has been made to good feeling between the people of this country and those of Ireland. All I can say is that it is the opinion of hundreds of thousands of the people of Ireland the sooner that feeling is established the better; but it cannot be established as long as we have Members—such as the hon. Member for Deptford—sneering at men whom he knows are regarded with feelings of veneration by thousands of people, who are the hon. Member's fellow-subjects. He told us that Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien were murderers; he told us that we, the Irish people, were a peculiar people; that the Government of America, in the matter of extradition, was not influenced by right, by justice, or by law, but by the meanest possible object, that of catching the votes of the Irish people, and that for that reason, and that reason alone, they exercised their powers. A speech of more studied insult was never uttered in this House, and I say it is painful to think that when a speech of that kind is delivered, not a Gentleman upon these Benches, or upon the Front Opposition Benches, rises to protest against the insults that have been directed against their countrymen and us. This Government have but a few months of power remaining to them, and recent elections point pretty clearly to the fact that when next this question is brought before the House it will not be the Home Secretary of ex-Fenian sympathies who will have to reply on behalf of the Home Office. It is quite clear that from the right hon. Gentleman and his friends we have little to expect, but we may expect a good deal from his successor in office. It would allay agitation in Ireland and satisfy a strong demand made there, if some right hon. Gentleman from the Front Opposition Bench would give an assurance that when the present Opposition have the power the cases of these men shall be re-considered. I am not asking any man to guarantee a release, but that these cases shall be re-considered in view of the fact that most extraordinary facts have come to light bearing on some of these cases in the

*Mr. W. H. K. Redmond*

closest possible way. The present Government refuse to go so far as that, but I doubt if even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir W. Harcourt) would refuse inquiry. I think we may call on him for some expression of his opinion. Yet I do not know why we should expect any special sympathy from him. These men are kept in prison because at one time they were members of the Fenian Organisation. It has not been proved that they committed any dynamite offence, and they were not tried for such an offence. The evidence given against them went back for almost 20 years, when they were members of the Fenian Brotherhood, and this excited a prejudice against them. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby takes every opportunity to sneer at a considerable section of the people of Ireland who have much respect and sympathy for the efforts made years ago by members of that Association to gain the ear of the world for the wrongs of Ireland before any attempt was made in this House to bring those wrongs forward. We do not desire Fenian Home Rule. Our request is that these cases may be re-considered and brought to proof; our desire is that this quarrel may be settled once for all, and that fairly. Let me tell the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby that he is not preparing the way for a mutual agreement by sneering at mention of the Fenian movement in Ireland, which made the Parliamentary movement here possible. Who paved the way for the movement of Mr. Parnell but the men of 20 years ago? But for the work of those men the Home Rule movement would not be now sufficiently advanced to enable the right hon. Gentleman to declare himself a Home Ruler. I say this in most perfect good faith, because I have but recently come across from our country, where I have attended public meetings and where I have spoken of these men. I tell the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Morley), who is looked upon with greater respect in Ireland than is the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby—I tell him that some of those men have been most active, have done most to promote the cause of goodwill

between the two countries upon the lines laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. Gladstone). Some of these men are most eager to reach out their hands and help to bridge over the quarrel of centuries between kindred peoples. Yet some of these men have been insulted because they have not been able to carry elections, though they poll thousands. The mention of such men has raised a sneer from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby as being mere Fenians. Let us have no more talk of that kind. If we are going to come to terms, as I hope we may—if we are going to have a genuine treaty of real and lasting peace between England and Ireland, let it be with the whole of Ireland—not excluding a considerable section of the Irish people from that treaty with a sneer at them because they belonged to the movement of years ago, which now, apparently, is strongly condemned on both sides. Why should you be afraid of any inquiry? The Home Secretary seems to have any amount of information which has never seen the light of day. What objection is there to have this information subjected to impartial inquiry? If the truth is on his side, it will become manifest. All we ask is that the Government will at least inquire into the cases of these men now in prison. So moderate a request is it that I cannot understand why it is refused. We ask for inquiry at which evidence, not given, at the trial may be produced; for instance, the evidence of the Head Constable of Birmingham. His evidence was of the most startling character, but he had no opportunity of giving it at the trial of these men. Why not now take his sworn testimony? As the truth appears let the men be released or remain in prison, but do not irritate the people of Ireland by refusing the inquiry they so passionately demand.

(11.40.) MR. HALDANE (Haddington): I do not propose to import into the few words I desire to say any controversial arguments. It seems to me the late Home Secretary and the present Home Secretary are in an equally difficult position. They are the representatives of justice in this House; their business is to administer the law; and if any appeal is to come before the Govern-

ment on this matter, it seems to me it comes best from a private Member; and it is for this reason and feeling that it is well that something should be said in this Debate from this part of the House that I intervene for a few moments. I have always thought that a tribunal such as is a jury acting under the direction of a Judge and after full investigation on the spot is more competent to judge of a question of this kind than we are. It is not easy for us to review in heated debate in this House the verdict arrived at, and I shall assume, rightly or wrongly, that the verdict of the jury is treated—by some of us at least—as conclusive. But it seems to me the matter does not end there. These men have been in penal servitude for eight years, and some of us know what that means. (Laughter.) Some hon. Members seem to think it is a light matter to serve eight years in such torture, but it seems to me an adequate punishment for most offences. These men have served for a long period, and it does seem to me that, even on the admitted facts, there is a distinction in the positions as between Daly and Egan and the others. I am sure I do not wish to exaggerate, and I observe a response from the Home Secretary himself. I do think that the time has come when it may be well for the Government to consider whether the clemency of the Crown might be extended to some of these cases drawing some distinction. I should say it is not desirable, or in the interests of justice, that verdicts and sentences should be debated by such a tribunal as this. But there is an element which seems to distinguish these offences, even putting them at their worst, from ordinary criminal offences. We must remember this, that what Egan did—or for the matter of that, what Daly did—would be done by hundreds of men throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, men with whom most of us in other respects would be proud to associate. Reference has been made to a speech of mine. I adhere to it. I repeat it—every word. However wrong, however wicked, it is for men to commit these offences, these heinous crimes, yet still we must look at the



circumstances, the motives; aye, and the passions, actuating the men at the time. They were, after all, at the time but the vehicles of a mass of political feeling, the intensity of which is best measured by the intensity and duration of the struggle maintained for Irish liberty. I do not argue that this justifies challenging the verdict of the jury or treating these as political crimes, but I argue there is a reason for extending the clemency of the Crown to the less guilty among these men. It may be well in these days when the Chief Secretary has entered upon a constructive policy towards Ireland, and is trying to inspire the Irish people with the belief that he, too, is earnest in the intention that at last justice shall be extended to that country—it might be worth while for the Government to consider whether clemency might not be extended to others beside Egan, but in any case to him. It does seem to me the time has come to consider, not necessarily the question of guilt or innocence, but whether eight long years of torture in penal servitude—and no more degrading punishment can be inflicted—is not a sufficient punishment to expiate a crime into which they were led in the tumult of political passion, and in which they had the support of many of their countrymen.

(11.49.) MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): These men were made Fenians by your English laws; and when there are so many professions made as to the interest this House takes in Irish affairs, I can only say that a stranger entering the Gallery of this House would be surprised to find that neither on the Front Government Bench, or on the Opposition Front Bench, is there a single friend of this oppressed and enslaved people. On the Front Opposition Bench are the men who committed these men to prison, and they are faced by the Government who keep them there. With all the professions of friendship for Ireland these Members of the House are too cowardly to raise a voice on behalf of these prisoners. Where is the Opposition who promise us all good things in the future? Where is the great, slashing voice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby? Where is the

right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle? Where are the leaders of the Opposition? The benches behind are packed with men who will not open their mouths. On exception there has been, and we thank the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. Would not capital punishment be better than this prolonged torture in prison? We have had all sorts of weapons used in the past against the life-blood of Ireland, and we have now a Home Secretary who, in the past, claimed our support with promises to be honest to our cause; but the Home Secretary is an English lawyer, with all the greed of office in his heart. He refuses an inquiry. He has the machinery in his hand, but he will not use it. Is he afraid of the evidence that might be forthcoming? (Interruption.) This is an Irish question, and it suits the persecutors of our race, from Deptford and elsewhere, to jeer at it, and others laugh. But we, with the sympathetic natures of our countrymen, with honest and cultivated good nature, cannot understand this refusal of a request for reconsideration by means of your own machinery. For their own purposes lawyers on either side unite to retain these men in prison. I have no faith in lawyers who, retaining the nourishing morsel, hand the shells to parties in a suit. On either side we have too many lawyers in this House. We are promised Home Rule by the Opposition but why have we not sympathy and support on this occasion? You split up our Party, and you live on our blood. But I know that others of my friends desire to speak, and I will not stand in their way.

(11.54.) MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): I beg to move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed: "That the Debate be now adjourned."

(11.55.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am sorry that the hon. Member should take that course on this Amendment. The Debate on the Address has already occupied three days, and there remain at least two other Amendments which cannot be disposed of in a few hours. I should have thought that this discussion

*Mr. Haldane*

which has continued since half-past 6, might now be brought to a termination, to the satisfaction of the House generally. The facts have been fully brought out and discussed, and my right hon. Friend has certainly adequately represented the view of the Government.

(11.57.) MR. J. G. FITZGERALD (Longford, S.): I think the Leader of the House is mistaken. It is true a great many facts have been brought out, but it is equally true that nearly all the benches on the Government side have been empty during the night. There are further facts to be brought out, and I think, under the circumstances, the Debate should be allowed to continue to-morrow.

Debate adjourned till to-morrow.

### MOTION.

#### FOREIGN GOODS (MARK OF ORIGIN) BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Howard Vincent, Bill for the placing of a Mark of Origin upon Foreign Goods, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Howard Vincent, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Byron Reed, Mr. Johnston, Sir John Colomb, Mr. Maclure, Colonel Bridgeman, Mr. Brookfield, and Mr. Baumann.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 130.]

#### VOLUNTEER FORCES (JURY EXEMPTION) BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Howard Vincent, Bill for the Exemption of Efficient Volunteers from Jury Service, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Howard Vincent, Colonel Eyre, Colonel Brookfield, and Mr. Boord.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 131.]

#### LABOURERS' COTTAGES GARDENS BILL.

On Motion of Sir Edward Birkbeck, Bill to confer powers on Rural Sanitary Authorities with respect to providing Gardens for Labourers' Cottages, ordered to be brought in by Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Jesse Collings, Colonel Eyre, Mr. Hobhouse, Sir Charles Hall, Viscount Ebrington, and Mr. Fellowes.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 132.]

#### SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT (1879)

##### AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cross, Bill to amend "The Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cross, Mr.

Coghill, Mr. Gully, Mr. John Kelly, Mr. Matkinson, Mr. Talbot, and Sir Richard Temple.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 133.]

#### GROCCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Leng, Bill to abolish Dealers' or Grocers' Certificates in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Leng, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Esslemont, and Mr. John Wilson (Govan).

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 134.]

#### PLACES OF WORSHIP (SITES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John Ellis, Bill to give further facilities for the acquisition of Sites for Places of Worship, ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur, and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 135.]

#### EIGHT HOURS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cuninghame Graham Bill to limit the hours of labour to Eight Hours per day in all trades and occupations, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cuninghame Graham and Mr. Conybeare.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 136.]

#### DEACONS (CHURCH OF ENGLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sydney Gedge, Bill to amend the Law affecting Deacons in the Church of England, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sydney Gedge, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Maclure, and Mr. MacInnes.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 137.]

#### RURAL LABOURERS' COTTAGES BILL.

On Motion of Lord Henry Bruce, Bill to provide improved Cottages for Rural Labourers, ordered to be brought in by Lord Henry Bruce, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Sir John Kennaway, and Mr. Gray.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 138.]

#### LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ACQUISITION OF LAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Knowles, Bill to facilitate the acquisition of Land by Local Authorities, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Knowles, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, and Mr. Powell.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 139.]

#### MILLBANK PRISON BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Gorst, Bill to transfer the site of Millbank Prison to the management of the Commissioners of Works, ordered to be brought in by Sir John Gorst and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 140.]

More may be had if a proper inquiry is made. I do not think that such an inquiry would need to be very protracted, or very expensive; the whole of the evidence would be immediately upon the spot—a large Commission would not be necessary. What would be necessary would be that certain experts should be placed upon it who could bring out all the facts of the evidence and tabulate them in such a way that reasonable conclusions might be framed upon them. In the last 17 years which have elapsed since the appointment of the Noxious Gases Commission, science has done a great deal in the direction of mitigating evils of this class, and one hopeful sign which we had, even then, was that whenever the Legislature, acting judiciously, had put its foot down firmly and said "this thing should not be," it always happened that science found some way out of the difficulty which enabled the wishes of the legislature to be carried out without any serious injury to manufacture, and with enormous benefit to the rest of the population. The evil is great undoubtedly, but so also would be the effects of any sensible remedy which could be applied; and I think that at all events, before sitting down and saying that London fog is a thing that cannot be conquered and must be endured, we should at least take the step of seeing whether it is not within some control at our hands if we adopt the proper means and the proper expedients. There is one distinguished scientist, I think he is a Scotch Professor, who has devoted several years of his life to the special investigation of what the properties and constituents of London fog are, and he has come, I understand, to very definite conclusions upon the subject—conclusions which I have no doubt he would be prepared to submit to any Commission properly appointed. I cannot believe that any Bill proceeding from any private Member, however well he may be acquainted with the subject, can possibly deal with a question so far reaching in its immediate effect and in its future consequences; but I do venture to think (speaking far more in the interests of the poor and needy than in those of Members of your Lordships' House, or what may be called the more

*Viscount Midleton*

well-to-do classes of the community) that some effort should be made to grapple with this terrible nuisance. To Members of your Lordships' House, or to persons who are so situated that they can leave London if they find it disagreeable, it is possible to fly from the evil; but nine-tenths of the whole population within the Metropolitan area must stay, whether they like it or not. To many of them it means the cutting off of their daily bread, and that sometimes for days, though not, I am thankful to say, for weeks together; to many more (and particularly to women) it means the carrying on of their avocations under circumstances of the greatest personal peril, and the greatest risk to their lives and health. In all cases it means a steady sapping of the vital energies which, if not apparent at the time, is quite certain to make itself felt within a not very distant period. I say nothing of the enormous waste of fuel thus poured up into the air out of our chimneys, which ought to be consumed below and give out its heat; I say nothing of the enormous expense which is occasioned by the deterioration of furniture, of pictures, of every article of domestic economy and domestic luxury which comes within the influence of this all-pervading plague; I say nothing of the actual expense to which the community is put by the precautions which have to be taken on the recurrence of every fog, or of the enormously increased consumption of gas which takes place even when that fog lasts only a few hours, meaning to houses of business, and to the poorer classes, a very serious addition to their annual outgoings. It is on behalf of those who cannot plead for themselves in this matter that I hope Her Majesty's Government will be induced to institute a full and searching inquiry into the whole question, and that not until the results of the inquiry are before your Lordships' House and before the public, will they despair of being in one way or another able to deal with the matter which so largely affects the comfort and health and the lives of the whole of the population within the Metropolitan area. My Lords, I now venture to put to Her Majesty's Government the Question that stands in my name:—To ask Her Majesty's

Government whether they are prepared to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the causes of the prevalence of fogs in London; to ascertain how far, and by what means, they are preventible; and to make such recommendation as, after inquiry, they may deem advisable.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I have been unable to discover to what Department of Her Majesty's Government the question of London fog belongs, and, having failed to ascertain the right man to answer my noble Friend, I am compelled to do it myself. I am told the London County Council are the people to answer, but I do not see them opposite, and therefore I am afraid I must undertake the duty on their behalf. My Lords, nobody, I think, will differ from my noble Friend in the invective which he has delivered against the London fog; I think he will carry the universal opinion of both Houses of Parliament and of all the inhabitants of the Metropolis with him in the strong feelings to which he has given expression. But, of course, there is a long distance between recognising the existence of an evil and believing that a remedy is easily to be found; and I think, before you go into the question of remedies for the London fog, you should ask yourselves precisely what it is that you hope to remedy. I apprehend that it would be much more accurate to say that what we can remedy is the colour of the fog; but I never heard of anybody who proposed a remedy for the London fog itself. The London fog comes, in the first place, from the Essex marshes, and, probably, beyond that, from the sea, and you might as well propose a remedy for the East wind, as propose a remedy for the London fog in its natural condition. That circumstance disposes of some of the arguments which, with considerable pathos and eloquence, my noble Friend advanced; because its power of interfering with the avocations of daily life is derived quite as much from its existence as a fog as from the particular colour which it assumes. The worst fog I ever

saw was about four years ago, when you actually could not see your own boots when you were walking on the parade—it was absolutely white. A fog of that kind will go on as long as the Essex marshes and the North Sea exist. The question, of course, of the colour is another matter; that is, no doubt, one of the advantages which our advanced civilisation has acquired; and I quite agree with my noble Friend that there probably there are certain remedies. If you are willing to use a very drastic course of legislation, and if your administrative machinery is sufficiently vigorous to carry it out, you might make a considerable impression upon the colour of the fog. By far the most effectual remedy ever heard of was, I think, originally suggested by Professor Frankland, that everybody should be forbidden from using any other coal in London except anthracite coal. I do not know whether my noble Friend thinks he would ever get Parliament to pass such a measure as that, or whether he would get the English people to obey it if it were passed. But, of course, the immediate result of that would be enormously to increase the price of that coal, and, consequently, the price of living to the whole population; and he would likewise condemn the population to go for ever, so far as they remained in London, without ever seeing a fire with a flame in it; and I do not think that, for the sake of avoiding an occasional inconvenience, grave as it is, for a certain number of days in the winter, people would condemn themselves to a flameless fire all the winter through. That is a great difficulty which attaches to remedies of this kind. I believe that there is not very much to ascertain in respect either to the nature of the fog or the remedies for its colour which might be proposed. The difficulty is political—that you would require, on the part (I think my noble Friend told us), of the owners of 1,500,000 chimneys an amount of self-sacrifice which you do not get out of the people of a free country. You would require an extension of your inspectorial system which would frighten the most enthusiastic advocate of modern legislation. Conceive of an

inspector going to every house in London and seeing that the grate was properly fitted in order not to emit smoke! The burden of itself would be worse than the London fog. Well then, my noble Friend says, but why not inquire into these matters, and that we should not sit down and say it is impossible until we have inquired. He was candid enough to tell us that a much simpler matter, namely, the prevention of chemical odours, was subjected to remedies proposed by a Commission, and that the result was, even in his eyes, not wholly satisfactory. There happened, what I imagine often does happen with a Royal Commission in this country: they make a laborious, ample, and perfect investigation, and a most voluminous and interesting Report (which nobody reads), and then an Act of Parliament, which is brought in with a great flourish of trumpets and which disappears in the sands of July; and finally, after two or three efforts to pass an effectual Act of Parliament, the character of everybody is satisfied by passing some Act of Parliament which should have professedly the same object, but which, as my noble Friend testified was the case in the present instance, turns out to be a wholly dead letter. I am afraid those are the results of attempting things which are beyond the power of a constitutional Government and Parliament to effect; and, therefore, I am loth to consent to undertake the responsibility of issuing a Commission. If a Government has to issue a Commission they have to find gentlemen to act upon that Commission; and I assure my noble Friend that that is no easy task. If you cannot hold out to them any prospect that some great public service will be the result of their devotion, you will not persuade the competent men, who are not very numerous, to undertake the duty of a Commission. You may issue a Commission with men who are not competent; but the result will be very unsatisfactory, even in the first instance. I should prefer to recommend to my noble Friend a simpler mechanism, which will be in his own hand to work, and which, I believe, will effect, quite as much as a Commission, the ascertainment of any

*The Marquess of Salisbury*

facts which have to be ascertained. If he will move for a Committee of this House to investigate the question, Her Majesty's Government will gladly support that Motion. We will not undertake to find the members of that Committee, but that, no doubt, my noble Friend will do himself; he will be the Chairman of the Committee; he will be able to direct its investigations; and he will be able to reap that rich harvest of knowledge, of policy, and of public service which he foresees for anyone who is able to cope with this evil. I think it is rather a matter for the simpler machinery of that kind than for the efforts of a Royal Commission. I fear that if we applied the machinery of a Royal Commission to it we should raise hopes which would not be gratified; we should inspire fears which are not reasonable; and we should diminish the available number of competent men for other more promising fields of investigation to whom it is necessary for such purposes to appeal. I therefore am afraid that I cannot assent to the proposal of my noble Friend that there should be a Royal Commission, but I should be ready heartily to support the appointment of a Committee.

House adjourned at Five o'clock to Monday next.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 12th February, 1892.*

The House met at 3 o'clock.

### QUESTIONS.

#### ADVANCES UNDER THE LAND PURCHASE ACT, 1892.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): On behalf of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Knox) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total amount of advances applied for under the Land Purchase Act of last year up to 1st January, 1892; what was the amount of such advances applied for in Ulster during the same period; and whether he is aware that a feeling of discontent

ists among Ulster farmers at the difficulty of obtaining satisfactory arrangements for purchase under the Act? Perhaps at the same time the right hon. Gentleman can answer the question, of which I have given notice, how many, and what, counties of Ireland applications for sale and purchase, under "The Land Purchase Act, 1891," were received up to the 31st of December, 1891, by the Irish Land Commission; how many landlords and how many tenants were concerned in these applications; what was the total amount applied for, and what the total, so far, sanctioned; and what issues of stock, if any, have been made?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND** (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): With reference to the first question, the Irish Land Commissioners report that the total amount of advances applied for under the "Purchase Act" of last year up to 1st January, 1892, is 72,584, of which amount applications to the amount of £18,764 were made in Ulster. The Government have no information as to the feeling of discontent mentioned in the question. I am afraid I have not the information to enable me to answer the question of the hon. Member for West Belfast.

**MR. T. M. HEALY** (Longford, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say how many holdings does this amount cover?

**MR. JACKSON**: That was not included in the notice of the question, and, therefore, I have not got the information.

**MR. SEXTON**: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman cannot reply on any of the points raised in my question?

**MR. JACKSON**: I am unable to answer now. I have telegraphed for the information, but it has not reached me yet.

**MR. SEXTON**: I will repeat the question on Monday.

#### THE "GERMANIC" MAILS.

**MR. LENG** (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will explain how it was that the mails (800 lbs) for New York, which were not dispatched by the s.s. *Germanic* on 14th December, 1891, in consequence of her breaking down, were not sent by the *City of Paris*, which left Queens-

town on the same evening, but were kept instead till the sailing of the *Bothnia* on the 27th December; and whether he is aware that, in consequence of this detention, they were only delivered in New York on 6th January instead of 1st January, as they would have been if carried by the *City of Paris*?

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): The mails in question could not be forwarded by the *City of Paris* because she had left Queenstown before the accident to the *Germanic* occurred. No doubt they would have arrived much sooner by the *City of Paris* than they did by the *Bothnia*.

#### WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS AND GOVERNMENT FACTORIES.

**COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT** (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the serious complaints made that the Government Factories are absorbing an increasing quantity of work to the prejudice of private firms and the slackness of industrial employment, and if there has been any increase during the past year, or deviations from the undertaking previously given, that either the major or at least a very considerable share of Government work should be reserved for the private firms, who on the faith of such assurance laid out large sums?

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR** (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My attention has been called to complaints recently made by or on behalf of private firms as to the amount of work undertaken in the Ordnance Factories, but there is no ground for the apprehension that an increasing quantity of work is being assigned to the factories to the prejudice of the private trade. So far as the proportions of completed work can be estimated, the payments to the trade, which in 1888-9 were about 40 per cent. of the total, rose gradually until in 1891-2 they amounted to close on 50 per cent.; but as this computation debits the factories with the work done for them in the early stage of manufacture by the trade, the proportion earned by private firms was in reality much larger. The expansion of orders caused by the

"Imperial Defence Act" and "Naval Defence Act" has now subsided, and some slackness is necessarily felt in the factories as well as by the private firms.

CAPTAIN BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, is it not a fact that a great many of the operatives at the Enfield Factory are now under notice of dismissal in consequence of orders having been given to private firms?

MR. E. STANHOPE: No; that is not in consequence of reductions made in the work done at the factory in favour of private firms; it arises from the general reduction in the orders for warlike stores.

#### SORTING CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE, DUBLIN.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether there are several junior second class sorting clerks recommended by their superior officers for the appointment of first class sorting clerks (on account of a number of vacancies which are about to be filled up in the General Post Office, Dublin) over the heads of a number of their senior brother officers, who, by seniority, merit, and character, have a prior claim to the vacancies; and are the appointments to be made by selection or by seniority and merit?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: There are two vacancies in the first class of sorting clerks at Dublin: no recommendations have as yet been made respecting them. Promotion to the first class is by a rule of the Service governed by considerations of superior fitness.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I would beg the right hon. Gentleman to look into this matter personally, for there are grave suspicions that promotion in these cases goes by favouritism, and we shall watch this matter closely.

#### THE LIMERICK LUNATIC ASYLUM.

MR. O'KEEFFE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if any adequate reasons exist for the exclusion of the Mayor of Limerick from the list of Governors of the Limerick Lunatic Asylum; whether he is aware that it

MR. E. Stanhope

has been the invariable custom to appoint the Mayors of Limerick on this Board by right of their office; and whether such practice will be revived?

MR. JACKSON: I have made inquiry into the matter mentioned in the hon. Member's question, and I find it is the case that up to 1890 it had been the practice for the Lord Lieutenant in the exercise of his discretion to select the Mayor of a city or town as a Governor of the district lunatic asylum for his term of office. The Lord Lieutenant then introduced a new system with regard to the appointment of Governors, so as to give the several contributing bodies a direct voice in the nomination of their representatives. The name of the Mayor of Limerick was not included by the Corporation in their list of nominees for 1892, and therefore this gentleman was not selected.

MR. O'KEEFFE: The gentleman was not actually Mayor at the time the Corporation made their nominations; but it has been the custom to appoint the Mayor by right of his office.

MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): In reference to this matter, may I ask, are we to understand that in any case where a Town Council recommend the Mayor then he will be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant? I may mention that something of the same kind occurred at Wexford.

MR. JACKSON: The hon. Member rather turns round on my answer. I said, the name of this gentleman not appearing on the list of the Corporation, he was not selected by the Lord Lieutenant; but I cannot go so far as to give a pledge that in the case where the Mayor is on the list he will be selected, though probably that would be so in the ordinary course.

#### SCHOOL BOOKS IN VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

MR. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the managers of voluntary schools have power to make a charge for school books, and to demand quarterly payments in advance in respect thereof?

**THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL** (Sir W. HART-DYKE, Kent, Dartford): If the hon. Member will be good enough to give me the particulars of the case to which I presume he refers, I shall be in a better position to judge what is the state of the law in regard to it; but I do not think that a demand for a quarter's payment in advance could, in any circumstances, be sustained.

#### RETURN OF DEER FORESTS (SCOTLAND).

**MR. FRASER MACKINTOSH** (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that the Deer Forests (Scotland) Return, lately distributed, is not in conformity to the order of this House on August 5th, 1891; and whether he will instruct that a corrected Return be prepared, cancelling that issue?

**THE LORD ADVOCATE** (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): My attention had not been specially called to this Return until I saw the question of the hon. Member. I have made inquiry as to the cause of the disconformity referred to, but have not as yet had time to receive a reply. I shall be glad to communicate the result of my inquiry to the hon. Member as soon as I receive it.

#### SALARIES OF ATTENDANTS IN IRISH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.

**MR. W. CORBET** (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that much dissatisfaction exists among the attendants at the Richmond District Lunatic Asylum in regard to the smallness of their pay and allowances; whether the attendants on the insane in Ireland are placed on a scale of wages and allowances very far below what exists in public asylums in England; and whether he will cause an independent inquiry to be made?

**MR. JACKSON**: I understand that it is the case that in 1889 certain of the male attendants at the Richmond District Asylum memorialized the Governors for an increase in their remuneration, but that the Governors declined to accede to their application.

The rates of remuneration paid to the attendants in Ireland are, I believe, lower than in England; but this is not limited to the case of asylums. The fixing of the scales of wages for the staffs of District Asylums in Ireland is a matter which rests wholly with the Governors in the first instance.

**MR. W. CORBET**: I shall be glad if the right hon. Gentleman will make further inquiry into this matter, for, as I understand, the Lord Lieutenant has the right to revise these salaries.

**MR. JACKSON**: I do not know whether the Lord Lieutenant has the right, but I think it would be a strong exercise of power to intervene between the Governors and their servants, seeing that the Government contribution towards the asylums is a specific sum, and the balance for the maintenance of the asylums must fall upon the rates. That being so, the Lord Lieutenant would be guided by the decision of the Governors, and would scarcely intervene to override their decision.

#### THE BURGH POLICE AND HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

**SIR JOHN KINLOCH** (Perth, E.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session the Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill?

**SIR C. J. PEARSON**: The Government are very desirous that this useful measure should pass into law, and they propose to introduce it in the form in which it left the Select Committee in 1888. The Bill is one in regard to which it is believed that Scotch opinion is unanimous; but it is evident that in the case of a Bill so long and so elaborate the opposition even of one or two Members would be fatal, and the Government cannot undertake to press it if it does not meet with general assent.

#### MESSRS. WATERLOW'S CONTRACT.

**MR. SYDNEY BUXTON** (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury on what date the latest contract was entered into by the Stationery Office with Messrs. Waterlow Brothers, and if the contract was entered into since 13th February, 1891, what steps have been taken to secure that a fair wage shall be paid



by Messrs. Waterlow to those they employ?

**THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY** (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): The 25th November, 1890.

**MR. BUXTON**: But may I ask whether it is not the fact that the contract was extended since February, 1891?

**SIR JOHN GORST**: Not that I am aware of.

#### THE ANGLO-SPANISH TARIFF.

**MR. SCHWANN** (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the advisability of obtaining from the Spanish Government a special tariff considerably below the new minimum tariff, which for many classes of British products is practically prohibitive; and whether Her Majesty's Government is striving to obtain such a concession, or to arrange for a renewal of the present existing Anglo-Spanish tariff after the 30th June proximo, the date on which it expires, unless more favourable terms can be secured?

**THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Her Majesty's Government claim under the Convention of 26th April, 1886, to receive up to the 30th of June next "most-favoured nation" treatment, together with the special tariffs which at the former date had been conceded by Spain to France and Germany. The subject of commercial negotiations for replacing the existing convention by a new treaty is engaging the attention of the two Governments, and a communication on the subject is shortly expected from the Government of Spain.

#### THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WEST HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS.

**MR. FRASER MACINTOSH** (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Reports of the Committee of Experts in reference to the West Highlands and Islands requirements have been received and considered; and if he will be good enough to state when an announcement of the intentions of the Government may be expected?

*Mr. Sydney Buxton*

**SIR JOHN GORST**: My right hon. Friend has requested me to answer this question. The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. With reference to the other part of the question I am unable to answer it at present. The matter still under the consideration of the Secretary for Scotland.

#### STAMP DUTIES IN IRELAND.

**MR. CHANCE** (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the exemption of documents connected with the administration of the Poor Laws in Ireland from liability to Stamp Duties applies to documents connected with the administration of the Sanitary Acts and Labourers' Dwellings Acts; and, not, whether the exemption will be extended to them?

**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER** (Mr. GOSCHEN, S. George's, Hanover Square): There is no provision in the Sanitary Acts or the Labourers' Dwellings Acts relating to Ireland which extends to documents connected with the administration of either of these sets of Acts the existing exemption in favour of certain documents connected with the administration of the Poor Laws in Ireland. With respect to the extension of the exemption in the direction indicated, should be stated that in England the exemption was formerly an exemption in favour of certain documents under the Public Health Act, 1848, and that exemption was repealed by the Public Health Act, 1872, and has never been re-enacted.

**MR. CHANCE**: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has answered the last part of my question, whether there is any intention to extend the exemption.

**MR. GOSCHEN**: No; there is no such intention, as my answer, thought, conveyed.

#### THE PRISON COMMISSIONERS.

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E): With the permission of the House I wish to correct errors in the published report of the answers I gave yesterday to the Member for Wolverhampton and to

Member for Bethnal Green. Besides Mr. Ruggles-Brise, recently appointed, there are now two other Commissioners of Prisons. Each of these Commissioners has now been appointed Director of Convict Prisons. The only other Director of Convict Prisons is Mr. Wakeford, who retains his appointment for two years only. When he retires, the plan of an amalgamated Board of three, mentioned before the Royal Commission in 1887, will be completely carried out. Colonel Garsia, I may add, has been appointed Secretary both to the Prison Commissioners and to the Directors. Sir E. Du Cane remains Chairman of both Boards.

#### 88. "EIDER" AND THE ST. CATHERINE'S LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LEA (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if it is correct that the officers in the *Eider*, recently wrecked on the Isle of Wight coast, were unable to see the light of St. Catherine's Lighthouse; whether the electric light at St. Catherine's Point is less effective in fog than the Wigham triform group flashing gas light of Tory Island, off the north-west coast of Ireland; whether he will consider the advisability of supplementing the electric light at St. Catherine's by the vertical sky flashing light recommended by the Shipmasters' Society of London and others; and whether, meanwhile, the experiment for producing thrills in fog, recommended by Professor Tyndall in his letter to the *Times* on the 3rd instant, will be tried at St. Catherine's?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): In the deposition made before the Receiver of Wrecks by the master of the *Eider*, no mention is made of the light at St. Catherine's having been seen by the officers of the ship, which struck on Atherfield ledge in a thick fog about 3½ miles from the lighthouse. Upon the second and third paragraphs of the hon. Member's question I have been in communication with the Trinity House, who state that whether the Wigham light at Tory Island is more effective in fog, can only be estimated from the results of experiments at South Foreland (Parliamentary Paper C. 4551, 1885), which were

conclusively in favour of the electric light. Experiments in sky flashing, so far as they have gone, have not been encouraging for the adoption of that system, and the Elder Brethren are in communication with the Shipmasters' Society on the subject. Professor Tyndall's letter of 3rd February was written under a misapprehension. Very powerful and perfect thrills in fog are sent from the illuminating apparatus at St. Catherine's, a sudden flash of over six million initial candle power being given for five seconds, followed by an equally sudden eclipse of 25 seconds.

#### PROPERTY ASSESSMENTS.

Mr. MORTON (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would take steps to make the assessments of property, on which House Duty and Income Tax are collected, the same as that used (the rateable value) by the Local Authorities, so that the assessments for the Imperial and local taxation might be uniform?

Mr. GOSCHEN: This could not be effected until a general valuation of the whole country is in force. Without such a measure no satisfactory rateable value could be fixed.

Mr. MORTON: May I ask whether, in 1888 or 1889, the right hon. Gentleman did not give a pledge to carry out a reform of this sort?

Mr. GOSCHEN: No. I did not pledge myself, but I very much regret that a very valuable Bill—as I thought—which was introduced did not pass into law.

#### MOTIONS.

##### BUILDING LANDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Munro Ferguson, Bill to enable Local Authorities to acquire Building Lands in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Haldane, and Mr. Leng.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 147.]

##### SMALL HOLDINGS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jesse Collings, Bill for giving facilities for the creation of Small Holdings of Land, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Burt, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Broadhurst, Colonel Cotton-Jodrell, Mr. Cyril Flower, and Mr. Hobhouse.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 148.]

## CORPORATE ASSOCIATIONS (PROPERTY)

## BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howell, Bill for the better securing their Property to Corporate Associations, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Howell, Mr. Beaufoy, Mr. Thomas Henry Bolton, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Causton, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Montagu, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. James Rowlands, and Mr. James Stuart.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 149.]

## BANKRUPTCIES AND ARRANGEMENTS

## (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chance, Bill to amend the Law relating to Bankruptcies and Arrangements in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chance, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. Murphy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 150.]

## OCCUPYING TENANTS' ENFRANCHISEMENT

## BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Bartley, Bill to enable occupying tenants of houses and places of business to purchase the Fee Simple of their Holdings, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bartley, Mr. Maclean, and General Goldsworthy.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 151.]

## REGISTRATION OF VOTERS' (SCOTLAND)

## BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shiress Will, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters, and to Parliamentary Elections in Scotland; and for other purposes in relation thereto, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Shiress Will, Mr. Campbell - Bannerman, Mr. J. B. Balfour, Mr. Buchanan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Donal Crawford, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Leng.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 152.]

## GUARDIANS OF THE POOR QUALIFICATION

## (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Sir William Plowden, Bill to do away with the property qualification of elected Guardians of the Poor, ordered to be brought in by Sir William Plowden, Mr. Philip Stanhope, and Mr. Winterbotham.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 153.]

## HANDLOOM WEAVING (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Saunderson, Bill for the regulation of Handloom Weaving in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring, Mr. O'Neill, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 154.]

## VOTERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hobhouse, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Registration of Voters in England and Wales; and for other purposes connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hobhouse, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Story-Maskelyne, and Mr. John Bright.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 155.]

## RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) (NO. 2)

On Motion of Sir Charles Dalrymple enable County Councils in Scotland, to report by the Sheriff, to sue actions of Right of Way, ordered to be brought in by Sir Dalrymple, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Campbell.

Bill presented, and read first time. [B

## DWELLING HOUSES RE-LETTING

## (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Provand, Bill to the Law relating to the re-letting of D Houses in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Provand, Mr. Edmund Roberts Baird, Mr. Caldwell, and Dr. Cameron.

Bill presented, and read first time. [B

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO  
MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SP

## ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [9th January]—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as follows:—

## Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

We take this first opportunity of expressing to Your Majesty our sincere condolence for the affliction which Providence has visited upon Your Majesty and this Nation in the death of His Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale:

We assure Your Majesty of our hearty participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Majesty's family under this grievous affliction, and in the deep sense entertained by all of your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which the country has sustained by the death of a Prince who had won for himself the general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."—(*Mr. Hermon Hodge.*)

## Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to be added,—"And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the time has come when cases of all prisoners convicted under the Treason Felony Act, who are, and have for many years undergone punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland, may be speedily reconsidered with a view to the speedy release of these prisoners."—(*Mr. Redmond.*)

Question proposed, "That those word be there added."

(3.58.) MR. J. G. FITZGERALD (Longford, S.): I desire shortly to state the grounds upon which I support the Amendment of my hon. Friend. There is an almost universal desire on the part of the Irish people that these political prisoners should be now released. So many weighty arguments have been urged by hon. Friends near me, so many unanswerable reasons given why the cases of these prisoners should be legally reconsidered, that I do not intend to labour that part of our position. I will content myself with saying on this part of the subject that any Member who remained in the House, and listened to the arguments on the facts advanced, cannot fail to have been struck with the character of the evidence by which the conviction of these prisoners was secured. I do not think that an assembly of fair-minded, thinking men, can deny that the case does require reconsideration, after hearing the evidence of a responsible officer of the Crown who is still presiding over the peace of one of the most important cities in England, and after hearing of the manner in which Daly was entrapped—strangely enough, entrapped during the time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby presided at the Home Department. I listened last night to a speech from the hon. Member for Deptford, who complained of the character and quality of the arguments which had been used, from this side of the House, by Irish Representatives in support of the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend. I take issue at once with the hon. and learned Gentleman. I protest against that complaint, and I say that those arguments, so far as they went, were conclusive evidence in favour of the release of these prisoners. But I confess that if the hon. and learned Gentleman, instead of making complaints against the character of these arguments, had contented himself with making a protest which I shall endeavour to make, against the falsity of the source to which those appeals were directed, I should not have found much cause of

quarrel with the hon. and learned Gentleman. I listened with great care to those arguments, and with a certain amount of humiliation to the appeals which have been made, notably the fervent, and nobody will deny honest, appeal of the hon. Member for North-East Cork. That appeal was being made in this House to the chief Law Officers of the Crown—the chief Law Officer of the Party to whom the Irish people have been taught, and to whom I have been taught, to look neither for clemency nor mercy on behalf of the Irish people; and I could not help thinking while that appeal was being made that a desperate endeavour was lying beneath it to conceal the real source to which that appeal might have been directed with some degree of success. You have appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary of a Coercion Tory Government for bread for the Irish political prisoners, and the right hon. Gentleman has answered you, not by offering you the proverbial stone, but by presenting you with a bomb, in the form of a love-apple, nine years old. He has answered you by making new charges, after nine years, against these unfortunate prisoners, and when challenged he refuses to lay upon the Table of the House one tittle of evidence in support of these charges. The right hon. Gentleman has gone further. He has practically told you that the reason that these men were convicted, and had these severe and terrible sentences, was that in times gone by, when the right hon. Gentleman himself was young and, perhaps, foolish, they belonged to a certain Organisation to which—I do not believe the Home Secretary, although he will deny it in England, can deny it with any degree of force in Ireland—he owes the honour of a first seat in this House. I do not intend to make any special appeal to him on behalf of the prisoners, and I say that during the whole course of this discussion it must have been apparent that a delicate effort was being made to glide over the thin ice which conceals a conspiracy of silence, which I think ought to be unravelled on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, whom I conceive, and I assert and declare to be, the real

gaoler of these prisoners. The right hon. Gentleman, since the commencement of this discussion, instead of getting up in the House and giving us the benefit of his weighty advice upon the subject of moment to these poor prisoners and of importance to the Irish people, has been hovering in and out of the House undecided as to whether he shall not expose the weakness of his friends by remaining silent, or whether he shall expose it by getting up in his place as he did last year and giving another twist to the vice which is tearing the hearts and the souls out of these poor prisoners. I desire to carry the memory of our friends back to the time when these men were arrested and convicted upon this very evidence which was procured from the Irish police, and when these men received those long and terrible sentences. The right hon. Gentleman was then in power, and what did he do? He suspended the Explosives Act of 1883, which only admitted of his giving to these prisoners a penalty of 14 years' penal servitude, while he had them tried under another Act—I think the Treason Felony Act—in order that he might be able to give them 20 years, and in some of the cases, sentences for life. The hon. Member for Mayo, who speaks with profound authority upon all Irish questions, has told us very recently that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had become aware of the wishes and of the aspirations of the Irish people; but that his ability to grant these wishes and these aspirations would entirely depend upon the unanimity of the Irish people and of their Representatives. Will the hon. Member for Mayo deny that we who represent Ireland are unanimous and without a dissentient voice on the subject of the release of the Irish political prisoners? and, if so, I challenge—I invite—the hon. Member for Mayo to get up in his place and make good that promise of future security which he has been making to the Irish people on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman and his friends. We are not here to barter away the interests of Ireland to any man, no matter how high his position, for flimsy promises. This is a matter of business. We want some earnest of

*Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald*

your good intentions; and so long as I have a voice inside or outside this House, I shall advise my countrymen not to enter into any political confidence trick with the right hon. Gentleman or with anybody else, but to transact this political business in a sensible manner, and make the best terms they can, and submit these terms to their own countrymen. I have always looked upon a Tory Minister as an extremely foolish man. I could not help thinking last night that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary might, at least, without pressure from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, if he were wise, have gone one step further, and, at a time when a great sorrow, which has been shared in by the subjects of Her Majesty in this country and in Ireland, has fallen upon her, have advised Her Gracious Majesty, burdened down by her own sorrow, to relieve these poor convicts from what he must know, and does know, is the heaviest sorrow which can be inflicted upon poor suffering human beings. But as the right hon. Gentleman has not seen his way to do so, and as the right hon. Gentleman opposite has not seen his way to press him, I have only to content myself by declaring again that it is my profound conviction that the Irish people and their Representatives, whoever they may be, will never obtain real justice from any Party in this House until they are able to do what my lamented friend the late distinguished Member for Cork would have been able to do if you had allowed him to remain here to-day with his 86 men behind him—not to crave, not to appeal, as the hon. Member for North-East Cork has had to do, but to demand and compel, as we will have to compel any Party when they do it, to give over these political prisoners to the Irish people as a token of their good faith in this "Union of Hearts."

(4.20.) **SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT** (Derby): The hon. Member who has just sat down seems to be under the impression that I have some disinclination to take part in this Debate. He is mistaken in that view; I have attended the greater part of this Debate with a desire to know whether there were anything new, either in fact or in arguments, to allege, as compared with

had been stated in former Debates on this subject. I am sure the House will feel that there has never been any question on my part of taking that responsibility which properly belongs to me. I have been for many years a Member of this House, and I hope that charge will not fairly lie at my door, that I have not been ashamed to shirk in this case the burden of responsibility which has been laid upon me. I have attended carefully to this Debate, and I know I have heard from the hon. and learned Member from Waterford the able and moderate speech that I heard last year. I have heard from the hon. Secretary the same reply to that effect, that I heard last year also, that I have not been able to discover in the course of this Debate any new allegation bearing upon the merits of the question. The hon. Member who has just sat down said, probably for want of acquaintance with the proceedings of the Courts of Law, that I suspended the operation of the Explosives Act and sought the indictment under the old Felony Act. If the hon. Gentleman were acquainted with the previous proceedings of a Court of Law, he must know that I had nothing to do with one or the other, that I had no voice whatever in the proceedings that should be taken against a prisoner. I am sure it is his want of acquaintance with the law that he should have produced a charge as that against me. I have nothing whatever to do with the matter of the indictment which was directed against these prisoners any more than he had himself. The Motion before the House is a general Motion for the arrest of all dynamite offenders. But in the cases, I think, of two political offenders have been referred to—those of the convicts Egan and Daly. As to the case of Egan, I have to say: The Home Secretary has expressed his opinion that there are distinguishing circumstances in that case which might make it a proper subject for revision. All I can say is that, if that be so, it is entirely proper and highly fair that that should be taken into reconsideration with reference to political offenders whom long sentences have been awarded. It is the duty of the Secretary

of State carefully to inquire into any case in which any particular circumstances, not disclosed at the trial, come before him for consideration. With reference to long sentences passed upon any prisoners, without distinction, it is the practice that these cases are always brought under review after a certain period has elapsed; and during my time at the Home Office, I very greatly shortened the period at which the revision of long sentences should take place. These observations would refer to all criminal cases, quite apart from the case of political offences. As to the case of Daly, what is demanded, as I understand, is inquiry. I know of no inquiry so regular in a case that has been decided by a Judge and jury as the inquiry which is made by the Secretary of State on the allegations of any circumstances which, in the evidence brought forward at the trial, or outside that evidence, should supply the proper materials for the exercise of the prerogative of mercy of the Crown. But that inquiry has been made over and over again. It was made by myself, as it was my duty to make it. It was made by the present Home Secretary as inquiry is made by every Secretary of State in office when he has sufficient material to inquire into. It is quite idle, however, to complain of the materials brought before the Secretary of State not having been laid upon the Table of the House, because if that were done no such inquiry would be possible. The inquiry must necessarily be confidential. The inquiry must apply to every circumstance, however little, which bears either for or against the prisoners which might influence the decision or clemency of the Crown. That is the only inquiry which it is possible to make; and that inquiry, so far as Daly's case is concerned, has been made over and over again. Now, the Home Secretary has stated the result of his inquiry into that matter, and I quite concur, from my experience at the Home Office, in what he has stated. The allegation—no doubt a most serious allegation—that the bombs found upon Daly had been planted upon him by the police, has been inquired into by all the means which there are at the disposal

of the Home Office; and I can only assert, in confirmation of what the Home Secretary said, that that charge is entirely unfounded. There is not a shadow of ground for that assertion. Besides that it is contradictory to the conduct and language of Daly himself. He had an opportunity at the trial of proving his own innocence, as every prisoner at his trial has. He never made a suggestion for one moment at the trial of a plot on the part of the police, nor certainly at any time that I have any cognisance of did he make any allegation to any person who visited him in the prison. Upon that point I must also confirm what the Home Secretary has said. I was convinced of his guilt by evidence that appeared to me as amply sufficient, that the bombs had been sent from America, and that they had been sent on the application of Daly himself. Therefore, upon the grounds put forward in this particular case, that there should be a revision of the sentence on account of a mistake, I, at least, must decline to admit the force of that argument. The case of Egan may be an open matter of consideration. The Home Secretary has all the material before him (which I have not) to enable him to form a judgment: He says he thinks there are grounds for dealing with that case in a manner different from other cases. I can only express my opinion that he will do right in giving them full consideration. Now as regards the case of Daly, I have stated fairly, and I hope sufficiently, what is my position. As to the general Motion, I have to ask myself first, separating the matter altogether from its political aspect, what is the character of the crime of these men?—what is his class of offence?—Is it one that in itself, apart from other considerations, commends itself to the leniency of the nation or the clemency of the Crown. That is the first question I ask. Now, what is the offence? In my opinion, it is the most heinous and grievous crime that can possibly be conceived. If I go over the whole category of crime I know none which is graver or more heinous than this. On account of the ease with which it can be committed, the terrible consequences that can ensue, the recklessness of the

dangers which are created, the alarm and the suffering that are produced, these, in my opinion, are not equalled, certainly not surpassed, by any offences known in the calendar of crime. I have myself been a witness of the terrible sufferings of the victims of these outrages; innocent persons who will never recover from the consequences. A policeman in Westminster Hall, and the unfortunate travellers on the Metropolitan Railway when the bombs exploded there, were visited by me in the hospital. These are the victims of a crime with respect to which burglary or any other offence would seem to be comparatively venial. Therefore, I cannot look upon this crime as one to which any mitigating circumstances can attach, or which can or ought to be visited with leniency. That being so, at the same time I would ask the House to bear in mind that grievous as these crimes are, and punishable as they were with penal servitude, sentences of penal servitude are reviewed within a limited period. A sentence of 20 years is reviewed at a period that falls far short of the 20 years. They have always been so, although I have myself established a rule on which a revision takes place at a shorter period. The point we have now to consider is whether that review, whether the re-consideration in the case of these particular crimes should take place at a shorter period, and under more favourable circumstances, than in other cases. Now, I cannot, arrive at that conclusion from the character of the crime. Well, if not in the crime itself we are to look at the circumstances. What are the circumstances to be relied upon to take this class of crime, admittedly heinous in itself, out of the general rule which applies to all other prisoners. Because, mark you, in accepting a Resolution of this kind you come to a conclusion which is to say to all persons who are the subjects of the Queen, and who will be naturally influenced by the opinions of this House, that these crimes, for some reason or other, are to be dealt with in a more favourable manner than other crimes. Therefore we have a great responsibility. We must bear in mind that responsibility, and act upon it. If you are to say to the burglar and the garrotter, who have

*Sir William Harcourt*

sentenced to penal servitude, as are men who were sentenced on special circumstances; and as you have been sentenced to 20 years penal servitude, or penal servitude for life, you shall undergo your sentence, and these men will not." Sir, the burglar and the garrotter naturally ask why? and you as responsible Representatives of the people, be prepared to say why men are to be placed under a different category from the ordinary criminals. Because, Sir, if these who sentenced to these offences are treated, while other men sentenced to 20 years of penal servitude are kept in prison, that would be a gross injustice, and some sufficient reason can be found in favour of a distinction. Before, I bring before the House the responsibility involved in making these penal distinctions. Well, let us ask what are the distinctions upon which these grave crimes are to be treated, and why they are to be treated in a different manner? The only reason I have heard alleged in this Debate—alleged with great force by the hon. Member who has just sat down—alleged with great force and with some justice by the hon. Member for North Fermanagh—is, that these crimes connected with Fenianism.

MR. W. REDMOND (North Fermanagh): I was very far from saying anything of the kind. What I said was this—that these men, instead of being convicted of dynamite offences, were convicted particularly and mainly as they were connected with the Fenian Organisation. The reason these cases should be treated differently was that these men were, many of them at any rate, to be treated as crimes by the tyranny exercised by successive English Governments in Ireland.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is exactly what I said and what I stood the hon. Member to say. I said they were men of the Fenian Organisation, and that they were convicted of Fenianism, and not of any other offence. They were undoubtedly indicted for dynamite and not for Fenianism, and the question is whether it was in consequence of the fact that they were guilty of treason-

felony that they were indicted for dynamite. That is the only circumstance alleged in the Debate. There has been a great deal said about Fenianism, and I do not think the hon. Member for North Fermanagh will be of opinion that I do him any injustice when I say that he passed a glowing eulogium on Fenianism and the Fenians. I differ from him. I will not denounce his opinions, but he holds contrary opinions to myself on the subject of Fenianism. Sir, what I understand by Fenianism is this—that it is a secret association which professes to accomplish revolutionary objects by violence and outrage. (Cries of "No, no" from the Irish benches.) I am perfectly willing to hear the opinions of others on the subject, but that is my opinion, and I doubt very much whether persons calling themselves Fenians will object to my definition.

MR. W. REDMOND: I am sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but will he allow me to point out that the Fenianism of these trials is that of 20 years ago, and that no man would more strongly repudiate the charge that they relied upon outrage of any kind than the men connected with these recent offences?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That these outrages were connected with Fenianism is a matter upon which I have no doubt at all. The proof was absolutely complete; but I am willing to take the hon. Member's opinion that Fenianism does not rely upon outrage, but upon force.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): You said "outrage."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I should like to know exactly what the "force" is. As arms of precision improve, so, no doubt, the methods of force may have advanced upon what they were in former times. I rely upon that, because I do not wish to enter upon any elaborate discussion upon the essence of Fenianism. I am really only endeavouring to express my own opinions. I understand I am desired to correct the phrase I employed, and therefore I will adopt the correction, and say that Fenianism is a



secret association which professes to bring about revolutionary objects by force.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is better.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I have to ask myself whether the connection of crime with a doctrine of that kind is a mitigating circumstance, and I must confess that, thinking the matter over, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is not. The connection of crime with a doctrine of that kind is, I confess, not a mitigation but an aggravation, because the result is that it becomes not only a crime against an individual, but a crime against society. Therefore I cannot admit that that particular circumstance in itself constitutes any mitigation of the offence. Now, Sir, the hon. Member for North Fermanagh has been good enough to address himself a good deal to me. He passed a glowing eulogium upon what the Fenians had accomplished. He said they were, in fact, the authors of Home Rule, and that they had brought about the condition of things which has enabled me to adopt the principles of Home Rule. I am quite sure the hon. Member for North Fermanagh did not intend to misrepresent me in any way. But he is entirely mistaken. The connection of Fenianism with Home Rule was not that which induced me to accept Home Rule. It has always been my principal difficulty. And I venture to say I share that opinion with the great majority of the people of this country who are prepared to support Home Rule. The only difficulty which the people of Great Britain have had in adopting the principle of Home Rule is from the suspicion and the belief that it was in some way or other connected with Fenianism. The hon. Gentleman the Member for North Fermanagh attacked me for saying I was not in favour of Fenian Home Rule; and I am sorry to find myself differing from him. I am not in favour of Fenian Home Rule, and I hope, and I do believe, that the great majority of the people of Ireland and of their Representatives are adverse to Fenianism and to Fenian Home Rule; and I hope I express the opinions of the people of Great Britain when I say that it is because they believe that Home Rule is not connected with Fenianism,

*Sir William Harcourt*

but that it is opposed to it, and that it will be an element in putting it down, that they are prepared to support the principle of Home Rule. Therefore, Sir, I desire to correct the impression under which the hon. Member for North Fermanagh seemed to be suffering when he reproached me for being against Fenian Home Rule.

DR. KENNY (Cork County, Southern Division): Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me —

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity later. Sir, what we at least who have adopted the principle of Home Rule believe and hope—and we do believe and hope in that respect, that we are acting not only in conformity with the opinion of the great majority of the people of England, but of the great majority of the people of Ireland—is this, that the measure of self-government which we desire is one to be obtained by constitutional means and used in a constitutional way. That is the view that we have, and it must be our object. I hope it is your object in Ireland, as it is our object in Great Britain, to dissociate the notion of Irish self-government altogether from the notion of Fenianism, and the object that Fenians have at heart. I thought it necessary to say that, Sir, in consequence, not of the attack made upon me, but of the appeal which was made to me by the hon. Member for North Fermanagh. Therefore, Sir, in my opinion those who are sincerely favourable to Home Rule will do everything in their power to dissociate the conception of Irish self-government from the ideas and conceptions of the Fenians. For the reasons I have endeavoured frankly to state to the House I find myself unable to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. W. REDMOND: I desire, by way of personal explanation, to say I find no fault with the right hon. Gentleman for declaring against Fenian Home Rule; but what we did find fault with him was for referring to some voters in the City of Cork as representatives of Fenian Home Rule and saying that Fenian Home Rule had received its death blow. These men who 20 years ago held opinions that were not

aised in this House should not be sub-  
ected to sneers simply because their  
ethods have been supplanted by the  
ill more effectual methods of the late  
Ir. Parnell.

MR. TIMOTHY HARRINGTON  
(Dublin, Harbour Division): Sir, I think  
we have reason to be thankful to the  
right hon. Gentleman the Member for  
Derby for the tone he has adopted. I  
am glad he has not been tempted into  
allying himself with a refusal to re-  
consider the case of these men. His  
one is more kindly and considerate  
than has been adopted on former  
occasions during these Debates. The  
last portion of his speech had reference  
to the question of Fenian Home Rule,  
and on that I would like to say that  
we have no objection to anything he  
has said, and that we will readily  
accept the definition of the plan  
and scope of Home Rule that he has  
laid down this evening. But what we  
do object to is this—that he used the  
expression “Parnell's Fenian Home  
Rule,” and we take that to mean some-  
thing which no Irishman would dare  
to repudiate. That observation ap-  
plied to a plan specially defined, and to  
a man who, undoubtedly, by his life in  
this House, contributed more than any  
other man in this world to turn  
Fenianism into constitutional courses,  
and to turn the feelings of his country-  
men, who had left their country with  
feelings of vengeance in their hearts,  
into constitutional courses. I thank  
the right hon. Gentleman for his state-  
ment, and I will say that our ex-  
perience is that he has been distin-  
guished for the careful consideration  
which he has given to the case of these  
prisoners. Sir, as regards the case of  
Egan, no new facts have been, or  
can be, presented. His case is  
the same as presented eight years ago.  
Last year the right hon. Gentleman the  
Home Secretary said that he was  
unable to draw any distinction between  
the cases of Daly and Egan, but I will  
ask the House to compare that state-  
ment with his definite promise last  
night that he would regard those cases  
as cases in which there was a material  
difference. I ask whether any addi-  
tional facts have come to light since  
last year, or whether anything has  
occurred to influence him except the

action taken by directing attention to  
the matter in this House. The right  
hon. Member for Derby and the Home  
Secretary, so far from weakening our  
case for inquiry, have strengthened it  
by the attitude they have taken up.  
At the trial, undoubtedly, a clear dis-  
tinction was made between the two  
men in question, and the Judge evi-  
dently believed that it was the duty of  
the jury to draw a distinction between  
the two cases. The only evidence  
offered against Egan was that Daly  
lived in his house, and that letters had  
passed between them, although there  
was no evidence that they were on the  
subject of dynamite plots. Against  
that there was Daly's declaration that  
he alone was responsible, and the same  
evidence might have convicted any  
person keeping a lodging house under  
the same circumstances. I maintain  
that were it not that Egan was an  
Irishman, and had been 10 years before  
in political sympathy with Daly's  
opinions, the jury would never have  
found him guilty. When the jury re-  
turned, after a quarter of an hour's  
absence, with a verdict of “guilty,” the  
Judge said—

“Those bombs were found in the possession  
of Daly. What I want to know is whether you  
find that Egan is a party to those bombs being  
prepared, and intended that a conspiracy  
should be carried out by the use of them?”

The Foreman said, “We are of opinion  
he was conspiring.” His Lordship  
seemed to be a very obstinate juror,  
and that conversation shows he thought  
the jury should not have returned such  
a verdict. The distinction between the  
cases of Daly and Egan was distinctly  
drawn there, and it was drawn further  
by the Judge in sentencing the two men.  
The right hon. Member for Derby as  
well as the Home Secretary have both  
complained of our endeavouring to give  
a political complexion to this question;  
but if anybody is to blame for these  
men being so regarded, it is those who  
are responsible for the prosecutions,  
and who arraigned them as political  
prisoners, as is shown by the terms of  
the indictment. The point of our argu-  
ment is, that if you drag in the poli-  
tical question to make a conviction  
more easy, and expose these men to  
that disadvantage on their trial, you  
have no right now to deprive them of

the advantage which follows a conviction for political offences. We deplore that any of our countrymen should have been led into the contemplation of violence, but we ask this House to consider whether the continuation of a policy of this kind would contribute to the better government of the Empire. Almost every agitation in Ireland has arisen upon such a question as we are discussing now. Requests for the amnesty of political prisoners have been allowed to rest by the Government of the day until they gathered force and weight, and so laid the foundation for fresh political agitations. Is it not a remarkable fact that the allegation with regard to Daly has not come from these benches or originated in Ireland, but that the statement that the bombs were planted upon him was made by the Chief Constable of Birmingham, Mr. Farndale, who could have no sympathy with our movement, and who was in charge of the Detective Department which was watching Daly? Daly was found in the possession of bombs, but the whole question is whether there is any truth in the allegation that they were planted upon him by the Irish police. It is clear that the police during seven months never lost sight of Daly, except during the one short period when he received the bombs, and it is a remarkable fact that they were ready at the railway station to receive him, and had an empty bag with them to take the bombs. Even if it had not been for the statement of Mr. Farndale, in that fact alone we have sufficient evidence to compel the conviction that, at all events, an inquiry should be instituted. It was said in the course of this debate by someone on the Treasury Bench that Farndale was not produced at the trial because he knew nothing about the case.

MR. MATTHEWS: I made an observation about the time, but I did not say Mr. Farndale knew nothing about the case, but that he gave no evidence about the circumstances.

MR. HARRINGTON: I maintain that he could have given evidence as to the circumstances, and that his evidence would have been of the utmost importance. I find from the report of the trial, that Daly commented upon

*Mr. Timothy Harrington*

the fact that Mr. Farndale had been kept out of the witness box. He referred to Mr. Farndale as the gentleman who pulled the wires, and asked why he was not put into the witness box so that they might find out how the wires had been pulled. Without going back upon the arguments which have been used, I wish to call attention to the time at which this trial took place. The prisoners complained of the newspaper comments made while the trial was in progress, and the newspaper I have here heads the report of the trial, day after day, with "Dynamite Plot." I was only a very young Member of this House when the right hon. Member for Derby proposed his Explosives Bill, and I think I am making no observation which will be offensive when I say that if at that time an allegation had been made against me, as an Irishman, of being connected with dynamite plots, I should have been very unwilling to entrust myself to a jury composed of gentlemen of the opinions held by the right hon. Gentleman at that time. I shall never forget the impression made upon me when the right hon. Gentleman proposed his Explosives Bill, and it was carried through its three stages in one night with all the solemnity and all the appearance of gravity, and I would almost say, of terror, as if the largest invading army in Europe had been at hand. I do not want to make a point against the right hon. Gentleman, but I think while those unfortunate explosions were taking place he would not have been a bit surprised to hear that some Irish Member was connected with them. Is it unreasonable that we should ask the House to reconsider the case of men tried at a time when the country was in this state? We believe that when the danger is past and the terror is gone, and when the exceptional means which were taken at the time to protect public buildings and the lives of the people have been effectual, a continuance of the imprisonment of these men becomes vindictive, and only gives cause for further agitation and disturbance in the future.

\*(5.25.) MR. JUSTIN MCCARTHY (Londonderry): I do not intend to keep the House very long in making

the observations I wish to offer on this question. I listened with much interest and attention to the right hon. Member for Derby, and there was much he said which I thought moderate and fair, and on the whole sympathetic; but there were many passages in that speech with which I could not find myself in agreement. I think he was unfair—not, of course, consciously, but, at all events, historically—in the view he took of the Fenian movement and the general purposes of the Fenians. He said they meant revolution of some kind by outrage, and he seemed to think that there was some connection between the Fenians and dynamite; and I find that such an impression does prevail, and is honestly and sincerely entertained, by many fair-minded men. I want, therefore, to point out to the House that Fenianism and dynamite have absolutely nothing to do with each other. The Fenians were a revolutionary party, but they never had to do with outrage by dynamite or any crime of the kind. I am sorry the right hon. Member for Derby did not on this question consult the Home Secretary, for that right hon. Gentleman would have told him that he had at one time very much higher opinions of the leaders of the Fenian movement than he admits now. But a Member of this House does not need to consult anybody as to what the purposes of the Fenians were, for they made those purposes known in proclamations and in action. They professed themselves to be a body of men who despaired of obtaining a national Government for Ireland by anything but force. I am not praising their policy, or saying it was a wise or possible policy, but it was published to the world. I remember when the Fenian headquarters were opened in Union Square, in New York, that people went in and out as they would do to a public office; that reporters for the Press went in and out also, and that the proceedings were constantly published in all the American newspapers. The Fenians crossed into Canada to endeavour to strike a blow at English power there; they arose in arms in Ireland in several places, and they endeavoured to capture Chester Castle. All these were things which, you will say, were

foolish and hopeless; but they had nothing to do with outrage or with crime of any kind beyond the crime, of course, of resisting the existing law. It is unfortunate that since there was an Act of Parliament passed in one night through the House against dynamite outrages, persons supposed to be guilty of such offences were not tried under that particular Act. It was rather doing an injustice to the poor old Treason Felony Act to arraign any dynamiters under its provisions. The Treason Felony Act was passed in 1848 to put down the Young Ireland movement, which was composed of men of undoubted honour, and no one of whom was ever charged by his bitterest opponents with the slightest sympathy with crime and outrage. What was the purpose of that Act? It was never intended to have reference to dynamite, for, at the time it was passed, dynamite outrage of any kind against individuals or communities was never dreamed of as a weapon of political warfare. These men were tried under this Act and convicted. It is now admitted that, in the case of Egan, a certain distinction ought to be made, and the hon. Member who spoke just before me made a good point when he said that nothing whatever new had been brought forward in the case of Egan, and if, therefore, the Government, out of its own moral consciousness, found something to be said for him, why should they not find that there was something to be said for Daly, in the sense of being in favour of further inquiry. It is no doubt a good rule of law that the Government should accept, as a rule, the verdict of a jury, but there are many cases in which the Crown has upset the verdict of a jury. There is the case mentioned by my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, of the men charged with the murder of a policeman at Manchester. There are some striking facts about this case which the House probably does not remember. There was a panic in the public mind at the time, and an attempt was made to rescue certain Fenian prisoners. In the course of that rescue a policeman was killed, and that was undoubtedly, in the legal sense, murder, as the attempt to rescue was

against the law. Five men were brought to trial on the charge of murder, and exactly the same evidence of identification was given in the case of each man. There was no doubt as to the facts, and the only question was who were the men immediately concerned in the act. The same identification was given in each case, and the men were convicted, the learned Judge, I believe, expressing his approval of the conviction. In the case of one of the men, Thomas Maguire, the reporters of all sections of the Press present at the trial came to the conviction that he was not one of the men concerned in the offence, and they sent a memorial to that effect to the Government. An inquiry was made, and it was found that this man was a Marine, innocent of all sympathy with the Fenian movement, of unstained character, and a loyal servant of the Crown. He was immediately set at liberty. Another of the men, named Condon, was unquestionably mixed up with the Fenian movement, but the point was whether he was mixed up with this attempt. In his case the American Government intervened, and addressed some kind of remonstrance to Her Majesty's Government, and though nobody knew what the terms of it were, the impression got abroad that the American Minister was able to show that Condon could not possibly have been concerned in the attempt, or even near the doors of the prison van at the time. That man, too, was at once set at liberty. These cases show that the verdicts of juries are not always conclusive of the guilt of prisoners, especially when men's minds are stirred by political passion and panic. Let us remember at what time Daly and the other men were convicted under the Act. There was a perfect scare and panic all over the country, and I do not wonder at it. Men's minds were kept at a stretch and strain, and one's faith in human nature seemed almost exhausted, and you could not tell at what moment or in what place some yet more hideous development of crime might take place. It was at that time these men were tried. It was one of those periods in our history when that most fatal impulse was abroad, "Somebody must

be brought to trial; somebody must be found guilty." Both Judges and juries are full of human nature, and is it not extremely likely that there was a sort of conviction beforehand that anybody tried on a dynamite charge was, at least, likely to be guilty; and did not this lead to longer sentences being passed than would have been inflicted in calmer moments? They were passed, no doubt, with the honest conviction that a harsher punishment was more likely to put down the crime; there was at that time in the minds of Judges and juries the one resolve to crush this conspiracy. Now we have come to calmer moments. That dynamite wave has spent its force. All that time it was found breaking out here, there, and everywhere; now that has passed, and everyone sees the utter folly as well as crime of trying to overthrow great political associations by the murder of a few innocent persons. Is it not now time, since these men have suffered terribly, when the right hon. Gentleman may fairly say that whatever they have been, they have suffered severely, and the interest of the whole community, as well as the common sympathies of human nature, will admit that they should at last be released from their bondage?

\*(5.45.) Mr. MAHONY (Meath, N.): I do not wish to add anything to what the right hon. Gentleman has just said; but, Sir, I do wish to enter my protest against the attempt which has been made by the Home Secretary, and also by the ex-Home Secretary, and of recalling to the House not the circumstances under which these men were convicted, but the outrages themselves, which attempt was made for the purpose of creating in this House and in the country a fresh feeling against these men, in order that their prison doors may remain locked. I protest against that, and say it is unworthy of men occupying the position which they occupy to appeal to prejudices of that kind. I wish, Sir, to say a few words on the case of Daly. The right hon. Gentleman states that after very careful inquiry he has come to the conclusion that Daly was properly convicted. There are, however, one or two circumstances in the case to which

*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*

wish to draw attention. The Head Constable at Birmingham stated to the Select Committee, to exonerate himself when asked why he did not arrest a man who gave Daly the dynamite, that he believed Daly's conviction was due to a plant on Daly by the emissaries of the Irish police. The right hon. Gentleman says he has satisfied himself that there is no ground for that charge, and he said last Session that he came to that conclusion on documentary evidence. Why cannot he produce that documentary evidence, let us see for ourselves whether it is satisfactory or not? Is that evidence a letter of which we have now heard for the first time as having been sent by Daly to a man in America called Breslin? If it be so the House, I think, attach very little importance to it. I am reminded by my friend that Breslin is the very man from whom Pigott stated that he received letters which were proved to be forgeries. There is a point in the Daly case which really calls for further explanation on the right hon. Gentleman's part. He wishes us to believe that the police arrested Daly by accident. They had watched him night and day for seven months, and I never seen anything suspicious in his behaviour. Did they know who he was going to see when he started for Liverpool? They knew he received the telegram, and from whom he received it, and yet we are asked to believe that he lost him the moment he arrived in Liverpool, and for two days could not find him. Yet they never thought of going to the house of the man from whom the telegram came; but it was the owner of the house who gave information to the police as to the station at which he would leave Liverpool, at the time. The right hon. Gentleman says he has inquired fully into the matter. I do not think his information is quite so accurate as it ought to be. He told us for the first time last night that dynamite was sent by a man called Breslin, in America, to a man in Liverpool, and was handed by him to Daly. Someone in the House started out "Macdermott," and the right hon. Gentleman at once accepted the name.

**MR. H. MATTHEWS** dissented.

**MR. MAHONY:** I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say it had been sent from Macdermott to Daly.

**MR. H. MATTHEWS:** I certainly did not say so.

**MR. MAHONY:** The dynamite was sent from Breslin to a man in Liverpool.

**MR. H. MATTHEWS:** I did not say that.

**MR. MAHONY:** The right hon. Gentleman did, I think, say that Daly had written to a man in America called Breslin?

**MR. H. MATTHEWS:** That I did say.

**MR. MAHONY:** And that Breslin sent dynamite which reached the possession of a man in Liverpool, and that from that man's possession it came into the possession of Daly?

**MR. H. MATTHEWS:** I said nothing about how it came into the possession of Daly.

**MR. MAHONY:** It is admitted that it came into the possession of Daly. Daly went into a certain house in Liverpool well known to the police, and the owner of which told the police where Daly was going from.

**MR. H. MATTHEWS:** All that is the hon. Member's, not mine.

**MR. MAHONY:** Does the right hon. Gentleman deny it? The whole case made for Daly is that he was asked by a friend to take a parcel and to put it away. Some of Daly's questions at the trial showed that he began to suspect that his friend had played him a trick, and our case is that Daly was not the man to turn on a friend unless he was sure that friend had treated him in a dastardly and cowardly fashion. He could not make out that case for himself, and so we are making it for him. The right hon. Gentleman denies that the cases of the 16 men were political, and says that they were cases of crimes of ordinary and very horrible character. He says that Daly is a fanatic. If he be, what made him a fanatic? What made O'Donovan Rossa sympathise with dynamite? It was the treatment of Ireland by the British Government, and his treatment in gaol after his conviction which made Rossa a dynamitard. You cannot treat men, even if they be Irishmen, as dogs without rousing a spirit of resistance and retaliation. An

hon. Member opposite said that treason was the worst of crimes. So it is, if Government be free; but if Government be oppressive, sordid, and corrupt, treason is not a crime, it is a virtue. I am old enough to remember the landing of Garibaldi, and no crowned head ever had such a reception in this country at the hands of the English people. And yet, was he not guilty of treason? Did he not sympathise with assassination? Why, Agesilao Milano was guilty of attempted assassination with his own hand, and yet Garibaldi's first act after he had accomplished the freedom of the two Sicilies was to grant a pension to this man. Yes, and I ask how did you receive Garibaldi who wrote about another man, who not only attempted assassination, but succeeded in assassination, the man who assassinated Rossi in the City of Rome—Rossi the Prime Minister of the Pope? This is how Garibaldi treated that assassination—

"The old world city being worthy on that day of ancient glory freed itself of a most dangerous satellite of tyranny, and bathed the marble steps of the Capitol in his blood. A Roman youth had found once more the steel of Marcus Brutus."

That man, Garibaldi, you received in this country with acclamation, and yet you raise up your hands in pious horror against men who dare to justify political movements, in which those connected with them never advocated, and never attempted, political assassination. (Cheers.) Yes, you are horrified at us for daring to speak in words of praise of men who have been guilty of treason; when it is a Greek, when it is a Bulgarian, when it is an Italian; aye, when it is anything but an Irishman, then these same men are not infamous, but are heroes. We have not justified the use of dynamite. We have deplored it. We have condemned it; but what we do say is this—that you cannot in honesty refuse to regard the motives which influenced these men. We have heard a good deal of the necessity for continuing the punishment of these men in order to prevent a recurrence of these offences. Is there any single Member in this House who believes in his heart that by keeping those men in gaol one single day longer you will do anything towards the prevention of the recurrence of these

crimes? There is no danger of their revival. I say no danger; but if there were any danger, it would be caused by such things as the harsh treatment of these men in Portland Gaol, and the feeling started by such treatment as that. Cannot you look, even for once, when it does affect Ireland; cannot you look at the other side of the punishment. Cannot you look at the reclamation of the criminal? Cannot you acknowledge that these men were not guilty of a selfish crime; that they had nothing to gain for themselves by these acts, bad as they were—terrible as they were. They had nothing to gain for themselves. Their only motive was not a selfish motive, for all they sought to accomplish was to direct attention to the grievances of their country. It may be useless to appeal for them. The Gentlemen opposite do not admit that we have grievances of which we have a right to complain, but of which we intend to complain, until they are remedied; but Members sitting upon this side of the House do acknowledge that we have a right to complain; they do acknowledge that we have grievances which must still be remedied; still more do they acknowledge that some years ago these grievances were of a trying character. If you acknowledge that, surely you must acknowledge also your responsibility for those grievances, for it is only lately, only within the last few years, that you have been made to acknowledge that these grievances existed. There is not a Member in the House who can free himself from responsibility in the cause which led these men to commit these crimes. Cannot you let that responsibility actuate you in the direction of extending to these men the mercy of the Crown? That is all we ask. We ask you to say, not that these men have not been guilty of the crimes of the terrible character charged against them, but that the danger of the recurrence of those crimes is past; that these men have suffered sufficiently for their offences against society; that they have suffered terribly; that their motives were not selfish; and that their cases deserve re-consideration. Their motives were such as to prove that somewhere in their hearts there is good. I

*Mr. Mahony*

appeal to this House, I appeal especially to hon. Members upon these Benches, to direct their attention not to future punishment, but by an act of mercy to try to increase the good that is in these men; to give these men some chance, yes, some chance of making some reparation to their fellow-countrymen, some reparation for evils which, in a mistaken moment, by a mistaken judgment, they were led to commit.

\*(6.10.) MR. HENRY JOHN ROBY (*Eccles*): I have listened attentively to the speeches that have been made upon this question, but I cannot pretend to have any acquaintance, more than the merest recollection of the matter, except what I have heard in the course of the Debate. I do not for one moment desire to separate myself from the remarks which have been made by many speakers as to the perfect fairness of the trial which took place, and the perfectly conscientious action of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Derry has very fully expressed the circumstances under which the trial took place, and I accept his statement of the circumstances as one of the grounds on which I am inclined to vote for this Motion. The admirable speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has, I think, pleased all parts of the House; but there was one portion of his speech which I feel I must separate myself from. He pointedly put the question towards the end of his speech—What is there in the offences that these men have committed that separates them from the ordinary class of prisoners who have been sentenced to long periods of imprisonment? The answer is in the words of the Amendment; it is an answer in very plain language, that it differed upon the ground of the political character of the offence of those—

"who have been for years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland."

I cannot agree with the hon. Member for Deptford and others who consider that treason-felony or treason, in any form, the highest offence in morals. In law no doubt it is. Law and morals have different rules and principles. In law you have to regard the facility with

which the offence may be committed, the great danger which may arise from it, the terror which it may inspire; but the motives of the persons actuated may be entirely different. The motive, in a question of morals, bears almost the whole weight of the burden, and I think the motive of persons engaged in insurrection should be weighed in different scales from the motives for common offences of persons who commit private crimes. I do not think that you ought to confine for the same period those persons who have been guilty of acts of brutality, and those persons who, through enthusiasm or political folly, or sometimes from very high motives of self-devotion, have committed crimes and have brought themselves under the laws of their country. The political character of the offence does legitimately and rightly diminish the horror and the severe judgment we should pass upon such crimes. I believe there has been some little miscarriage of justice in the case of Egan, and I cannot free myself from some suspicion in regard to the case of Daly. I cannot believe, at least without knowledge of such other facts as may have been before the Home Secretary, that the head of the police in Birmingham would have made such a definite and distinct statement if there was really nothing in it. I do not, however, put my vote upon these grounds. I say first, in the case of political prisoners, such as Smith O'Brien, and others, the clemency of the Crown has been exercised, and I think there are now grounds for that clemency being extended to some of the prisoners now referred to. I do not mean by voting for the Amendment that I definitely ask for the speedy release of all of them; what I ask is that the Home Secretary shall consider the cases of all those prisoners, having regard to the fact that the movement was an insurrectionary movement, and that they have now endured a very long and severe sentence—nine years' penal servitude—which I think may be regarded, under present circumstances, as sufficient. I do not want to imply that the Home Secretary has not given full consideration, as he thought at the time, to these cases. But time is in



some degree, in the case of penal servitude, the very essence of the question. It is now half a year since we refused, last August, to accept this Motion. Half a year is nothing; and if by an act of mercy he can, without destroying respect for justice, do anything which will help to relieve misery in some degree and to soothe the national difficulties, I appeal to him to do so.

(6.18.) MR. JOHN DILLON (East Mayo): In dealing with the question before the House I shall confine myself to two points only. But, first of all, I wish to say a few words of a personal character in reference to the prisoner Daly, with whom I was at one time very intimately acquainted. It is many years ago since I knew John Daly. I say at once, and I am not ashamed to admit it, that in those days I was very intimately associated with the Fenian movement, and amongst others with whom I came in contact was Mr. John Daly. I travelled for weeks in his company. I was associated very closely with him in some political campaigns, and I am bound to say that I formed a very high opinion of John Daly. He was a man who, I believe, was an artizan, but he was an extremely exceptional and intelligent artizan, and at the time that I knew him he was certainly a most effective and powerful political advocate in the cause in which we were working. During these times we had talked over Irish matters; we differed in those days as I suppose he has differed from me in the years that have elapsed since then. He was then of the opinion that there was no hope for Irish liberty except in a recourse to arms. I did not share his views, and, of course, I always tried to impress upon my countryman that there was other hope than in an appeal to arms; but in those confidential conversations, and there was not at that time any conceivable reason for his concealing his thoughts from me, he repudiated all form of crime except resistance in open arms. I bear that testimony to the political character of John Daly. At the time that I was associated with him his political opinions were thoroughly well formed, and I think, as I am just reminded, that he was then engaged in agitating, 20 years ago, for the amnesty

of the political prisoners. They have long since been released from gaol, and many of them have been engaged in exercising their influence to strengthen the hands of Mr. Parnell, the late hon. Member for Cork, in substituting constitutional movements for the movements for connection with which they were convicted. I have listened to the Debate; and from my knowledge of those days, I should be astonished, and very much pained, if the conviction were brought home to my mind, that John Daly had so changed his political principles as to join in such a conspiracy. The only thing I wish to say in reference to the observations that have fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, is that I do not see how it is expected—and I suppose that will be the object of Irish Members who join in this Debate—that we can increase the prospects of opening the prison doors of these men, as we all desire to do, by quarrelling with the Government. There were some observations in his speech to which I must take exception from my own knowledge of the Fenian Organisation. The right hon. Gentleman has, I think, some prejudice against them. The history of that movement was brought to the knowledge of the right hon. Gentleman by other channels than those which we possess; but I am perfectly sure, had it been brought to his knowledge by channels other than those he has been obliged to use, he would be the first man to see no injustice in the movement. The fact that John Daly and the other prisoners whose cases are now being considered, were supposed to have been connected with the old Fenian Organisation, and largely engaged in treasonable practices in the past, raised in his mind a presumption that they were likely to be connected with those dynamite outrages.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No; I argued that the crime was a grave one, but that I did not think, because it was a political offence, that it was a mitigating fact; but at the same time I carefully abstained from saying that it was an aggravation.

MR. DILLON: I can understand now what his point was; but considering the state of excitement in which the

*Mr. Henry John Roby*

English public mind was at the time, it is perfectly conceivable how, if it was proved to be a fact that John Daly was a member of the Fenian Organisation, it should be supposed that he was also engaged in treasonable practices, and that that would prejudice the minds of the jury against them. The newspapers were then full of dynamite outrages, and the jury would be more inclined to convict of dynamite outrage if it had been proved that the prisoner had been connected with the Fenian Organisation. To any person who knew Ireland the fact would have been apparent that if he had been an old Fenian he could not have been a dynamiter; for not one or two, but the whole body, without a single exception, set their face, from the beginning, against outrage and crime. So much was that the case that in Dublin it was reported by the police that as the Fenian Organisation spread, agrarian outrage decreased, and that that was one reason why they knew that the Organisation was extending. I bring that forward to show how people might have been influenced on the trial in connection with the Fenian Organisation, whereas the real question upon which they were tried was whether they were connected with the dynamite outrages. I take it that every Member of this House agrees that punishment should be preventative and not vindictive. If it can be proved that the release of these men would be no encouragement to crime of the same character, but that it would have an opposite effect—that it would have a soothing effect—upon the minds of people all over the world, and that it would have no tendency to reproduce those crimes, I think there is not a single Member in the House who would oppose the Motion. What has been the universal experience of those amnesties—the experience not of Ireland, but of all the world over? The experience in all countries, the experience of all mankind, has been that, after a movement which the State is bound to put down for its own protection, has been put down, and effectually crushed, the best means to defend the State against similar movements in the future is to exhibit a generous clemency to the men found guilty. And I venture to say that the

past experience of Ireland fully bears this out. This process in which we are now engaged, of moving for the release of political prisoners, is a chronic process, unhappily, so far as Ireland is concerned; and I venture to say this here, that I think that those who have been responsible for the Government in Ireland in the past, and agreed to amnesty, will admit that the result of amnesty for Irish political prisoners has always been satisfactory. Of course, I feel bound to admit that it is the right, even the duty, of the State, although sometimes it may be very mistaken—it is the right and the duty of the Ministers of this country to punish offences of the nature of treason and treason felony, and still more if they are clearly proved offences of the character which are charged against these men. I say that in no country in the world has it been more clearly or fully proved that the proper way to put an end to these offences, and the only way to put an end to these offences, is not by savage and cruel punishments, but by controlling and cutting away the roots from which they spring. And if to-day we find that the crop, the unhappily perennial crop, of political prisoners in Ireland is beginning to fall off—and for a considerable time, thank goodness, we have had no trials for treason, or treason felony, and severe sentences of penal servitude passed in connection with Irish politics—the cause of that is not to be sought in passionate convictions and severe sentences passed on political prisoners in times of panic; it is to be sought in the fact that a new hope has sprung up in the minds of the Irish people; that we have been able to remove these views from the minds and hearts of our people, and induced them to look to this House and to constitutional methods for redress. And for my part I felt to-day that I should not remain silent without making this appeal to hon. Members on all sides of the House to do this crowning act of clemency; and if you grant it I believe that the effect of it all through the ages to come will be to decrease revolutions in Ireland and those political trials which in the past have been a disgrace to this country. And, Mr. Speaker, I do sincerely believe, if the request

embodied in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford be granted and conceded, that not a single Member of this House will ever have the slightest reason to regret it.

\*(6.35.) MR. HENRY JOSEPH WILSON (York, W.R., Holmfirth): I do not intend to trouble the House for any length of time with a review of the arguments which have been brought forward on one side or the other. But under the circumstances I do not wish to give a silent vote on this motion, and I desire to tell the House in one single sentence why I intend to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford. I attended the trial in Ireland of certain men put upon trial for their lives, and I heard much that was interesting and shocking to me as to how such proceedings were conducted. I shall never forget one sentence which was uttered by the distinguished Counsel representing the prisoners, The Mac Dermott, who, in speaking of the grievances of which they had to complain, said—

“You first drive men mad by your methods of misgovernment, and then you seek to hang them for being mad.”

Now, it is because I believe that the methods of misgovernment by which Ireland has been oppressed for many a year has driven many Irishmen at least temporarily mad—because I think that these men in these cases under consideration have been sufficiently punished for this temporary madness—that I have not had, during this Debate, the slightest hesitation in making up my mind to vote for the Amendment.

(6.37.) DR. JOSEPH E. KENNY (Cork Co., S.): I am glad the hon. Member for East Mayo has interposed in this Debate, because he has been able to give, for the first time, a description of the character of Mr. Daly, and that the House might be able to judge whether he was a likely subject, from his personal experience of him, to develop into a dynamitard. I think the House—any fair judging man—who has heard the description of him, will come to the conclusion that he was not of the stuff of which dynamitards are made. The hon. Member for East Mayo has applied to me to appeal to Gentlemen who sit on these Benches

*Mr. Dillon*

around me not to say anything irritating to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. Well, Sir, I disclaim at once any desire of saying anything irritating to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. But there are some passages in the right hon. Member for Derby's speech to which I must take exception. In listening to that speech, the impression produced on one's mind would be that there was nothing, at all events in its mode, to which objection could be taken; but I think a little reflection will show that the purpose underneath it was not by any means so mild; and I take it from this fact, because the right hon. Gentleman, on a question like this, which is a question for taking a high and generous view of matters now passed into oblivion, and for endeavouring to put an end finally and for ever to a most disgraceful episode to this country—that in a debate of this kind the right hon. Gentleman should have let fall from him consciously or otherwise observations which, I am bound to say, are more or less graven on the episodes to which they refer. I have also exception to take to his definition of what Fenianism was or was meant to be, and I entirely object to his forming a new dictionary of what is meant by outrage. He has attempted in his speech to make out that it is an act of outrage to do acts of violence whenever these acts may be done in forwarding a revolutionary movement. I take exception to it, and I think he had no right to introduce it, and I take exception to his attempt to fasten on my dead leader, whom I shall always hold in honour, and whose death he and his friends contributed to bring about, that he should attribute to him a sentiment which was expressed in words of his own. He spoke of Fenian Home Rule and he spoke of it in his speech as Mr. Parnell's Home Rule, thereby intending to convey that the Home Rule Mr. Parnell had in his mind was Fenianism, while he knew as well as any man living that Mr. Parnell of all men was the least likely to adopt Fenianism as a shibboleth or cry, and that he above all men had weaned the minds of the Irish people from the paths of Fenianism, and shown them

hem that there was an alternative by which they could gain all they hoped for, and for which they were prepared to suffer and die. He says it was not Fenianism convinced him of Home Rule, but I wrote to put this query to him—was it not Fenianism that had made possible the acceptance of the alternative Mr. Parnell had pointed out? Did not he take his choice, and did not his colleagues take their choice, and would not this country alternately take its choice between Home Rule, provided it was full and complete, and the other alternative of a constant recrudescence of Fenianism and such movements. From beginning to end of the arguments, I am bound to say that with the form of the Home Secretary's observations I have no fault to find; but I think he bitterly disappointed me that, in the eleventh hour of the existence of the Government, he could not take heart of grace and, for once at all events, seize the opportunity offered him for doing a gracious act. Instead of that, he has endeavoured to prove that the offence out of which the subject of our present Debate has grown was of a non-political character, and that the perpetrators of these outrages were not to be distinguished from ordinary criminals. My hon. Friend the Member for Derry City pointed out in very forcible language the gross abuse that was made of the Treason Felony Act in connection with these prosecutions. The right hon. Gentleman found himself under the necessity of undertaking to prove that there was no political element in this matter. Will he deny that misgovernment is *fons et origo* of the whole matter? Will he assert that in Ireland there ever would have been dynamite outrage, or anything approaching it, if the government of the country were what it ought to be; and will he deny—I know he cannot—that misgovernment, as he himself in former days fully acknowledged, was at the bottom of Irish Fenianism and similar movements? He cannot divest himself of some of the responsibility of having created to some extent the political crimes with which we are now concerned. The Member for Deptford said these men could have been tried for treason, as they ought to have been,

which he held to be the greatest of crimes. If they had been, we never would have had this Debate, for then they would have been executed. The moment he said these men ought to have been tried for high treason he gave away, though he did not intend it, his Leader, whom he was imitating in his speech. If they had been tried for treason, would anyone say that that was not a political offence? For the Treason Felony Act was brought in to produce on men's minds this very impression: that the political movement for the amelioration of the condition of the country was in itself a criminal movement; that is to say, in itself morally culpable, as well as culpable, in the eye of the law. And the Government of the day knew well the difficulty of getting capital convictions on charges of high treason, as the public opinion of all Europe was in favour of altering intolerable political conditions by a revolutionary movement. The Treason Felony Act was introduced for the purpose of getting rid of having political traitors, as they were called, tried and executed. I wish to say one word with regard to Daly. Undoubtedly, anyone who has read the Report, which the right hon. Gentleman considered at least a perfectly satisfactory Report—satisfactory and convincing to his mind, that these prisoners suffered no ill-treatment—cannot read that Report without coming to the conclusion, if they are fair-minded men, that, without breaking a single rule of prison government, these men have been subjected to a series of petty annoyances at the hands of petty officials, which constituted a persecution in itself. There is evidence in the whole Report of that, but I will take one item which I think the right hon. Gentleman, in fairness, ought to take into consideration. It is admitted, and no attempt has been made to deny it, that Daly was poisoned three times. I am not going to insinuate that that poisoning had any more culpability in it than carelessness. Knowing something of the subject, I laugh to scorn all the excuses given that that preparation which poisoned Daly had got undue strength. Anyone who knows anything about

Government contracts would laugh at the idea of a drug being of undue strength, whatever it might be to be under strength. But if we take it in this way: Supposing Daly's sentence had expired, and the poisoning had occurred on the day of his discharge, he would have resumed his civil rights on that day. Would it not have been perfectly open to him to bring an action for damages for what he had suffered through this culpable negligence? The right hon. Gentleman knows it would; and I cannot but think that, in fairness to a man who has suffered so grievously as Daly, through this accidental poisoning, he ought to be moved through that element alone, in the consideration of Daly's case, to allow a large and immediate remission of his sentence. I hope the right hon. Gentleman may yet take that into consideration. He made, in my opinion, an exceedingly unfair allusion in a Debate of this kind to the letters addressed by Daly to Breslin. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, in speaking, further added that Daly never developed his theory at any period of the trial, as he could have done, that the bombs were planted on him by an agent of the police. Now, I find that at the very trial there is evidence that Daly had not invented the story. Daly commented in his speech on the fact that Mr. Farndale was not produced, clearly showing that he had in his mind that if Mr. Farndale were produced he would be able to put him such a series of questions as would trace the methods in which the bombs came into his possession. I was sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby insinuating that this was an afterthought on the part of Daly. The right hon. Gentleman says he was perfectly satisfied as to the genuineness of the letter Daly addressed to Breslin. I ask him was he not perfectly satisfied of the genuineness of Richard Pigott's famous letter? The *Times*, his ally, was perfectly satisfied. I venture to say that if this Motion were granted, and an open inquiry were held, another friend of the right hon. Gentleman might be found as being the inventor, the writer, and the sender of the letter. I allude to his friend Mr. MacDermott, who has been of such inestimable service to his

*Dr. Joseph E. Kenny*

Government. Daly most vehemently denies that he ever addressed a letter to Breslin, and that he received any reply whatever from Breslin; and he asserts from the beginning that the bombs were planted on him by a man whom he thought at one time was his friend, but who, it was shown from subsequent events, was a traitor to him and a paid agent of the Irish Police. There was another man indicted and convicted on the same indictment as Daly and Egan—I refer to the man MacDonnell. He was convicted of treason-felony, and not convicted of connection with crime or outrage. Why was not MacDonnell, who was set at liberty, not put in prison? No; the political element was introduced into the case to rouse the passions of the jury and get a conviction; and getting a conviction on the political element the punishment was meted out on the dynamite. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman now to say whether he will not take into consideration these facts and release these men from their confinement, which has been of so cruel a character. he releases those men who were actuated by no sordid, but by high and lofty, motives, he will do an act calculated better far to do credit to his Government and to bring about the pacification of Ireland, and to establish the English name in the eyes of the world, than if he were to introduce a thousand Local Government Bills.

(7.3.) MR. R. NEVILLE (Liverpool, Exchange Division): Sir, I regret I find it impossible to go the length which the Amendment invites me. If the Amendment had merely proposed an investigation into the cases of the men who were found guilty, I should have been quite ready, under the circumstances, to support it, though, as a general rule, I deprecate the re-opening of criminal trials in the House of Commons. If the majority of the Representatives of the Irish people desired an investigation, I should not, in ordinary circumstances, feel disposed to vote against it. But the Amendment goes much further than that, and to vote for the Amendment one must commit oneself to this—that men rightly convicted

and dynamite outrages should be released. So far as society is concerned, the time of which these men were convicted was the most serious that could be committed, and the question of their motives cannot in my view mitigate its gravity. It must be obvious that if society is to maintain its security, it is impossible to allow men to manufacture dynamite bombs without visiting their offence with the utmost severity of the law. There is, so far as the result is concerned, no difference between the men who are misguided and who act from patriotic motives and the men who are actuated by selfish brutality. Society cannot take that into account. Its first duty is to preserve the lives and limbs of its citizens, and nothing short of the severest penalty of the law would be adequate punishment for these dynamiters if they were guilty. Sir, the Amendment seems to me to come at an inopportune time. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down put my difficulty very well when he said that it was a question between Home Rule and a recrudescence of those outrages.

Dr. KENNY: I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby said that the choice of his Party lay between the continuance of Fenianism and the granting of Home Rule, which would for ever put an end to the necessity for Fenianism to exist at all.

Mr. NEVILLE: I daresay I took the words down wrongly. What I understood the hon. Gentleman to say was that so long as the existing conditions between this country and Ireland subsisted you will have a recrudescence of these outrages. But supposing that by either Political Party a sufficient measure of self-government is accorded to Ireland—a measure they are disposed to accept—I think it would be expedient, if not necessary, that it should be accompanied by a full amnesty to all who are suffering for political or quasi-political offences, and I would give *carte blanche* to the Government to say who should be released. Under present conditions, I do not think it would be a safe course to take; but if I have the honour to be a Member of this House when a measure of self-government is passed

that will be acceptable to the people of this country and Ireland, I shall be the first to wish to see all political prisoners amnestied.

\*(7.10.) MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I must say, as one of those who worked to put in the hon. Gentleman for the Exchange Division of Liverpool, that he does not in this matter represent the feelings of his constituents. The hon. Gentleman was returned by Irish votes.

MR. NEVILLE: I should be the first to express my obligations to the Irish Party in the Exchange Division; but I cannot admit what the hon. Gentleman says, that my supporters were exclusively Irish.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The hon. Member's supporters were mainly Irish, and it was they who worked hardest to return him to Parliament. I myself worked hard for the hon. Gentleman, and I will frankly tell him that as the hon. Gentleman has declined to vote for this Amendment, I shall again work hard in the hon. Gentleman's constituency, but this time it will be to relieve the hon. Gentleman of the responsibility of misrepresenting the Exchange Division. Sir, all we ask is the power of control of Irish affairs in our own country. The hon. Member said he would release these men when a Home Rule Bill was passed; but owing to the tortures to which these men are subjected, death will, I am afraid, have relieved many of them before that time arrives. If the hon. Member could not see his way to vote one way or the other on the Amendment now before the House, he might have had the good taste to have said nothing at all. As it is, I promise him when he goes down to Liverpool I will be there to meet him as I was there before. As to the prisoners, if they had been tried for high treason they would have been released before now. Our plea for special treatment for them arises from this—that they are the victims of a Government plot carried out under the control of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and paid for out of the Secret Service Fund. Jim MacDermott was brought over from America with British money, and he lived in this country in the best style

until he got around him his circle of victims. He is now in the service of the Government, and, like all the other scoundrels of the last 20 years, he was in the service of the *Times*. Sir, at the very time the police were entrapping others they endeavoured to plant dynamite on me. A member of the Royal Irish Constabulary came to my office in Liverpool and asked if I had got the small box that had been sent to me. From where? I asked. He said, "You know; from New York." I asked how much there was to pay, and he said, "I do not know; go and see." I suspected it was a plot laid, and trap set, for me, and I said that if the box was addressed to me the Steamship Company would have delivered it and demanded payment. These are the kind of tactics to which the officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary are ready to lend themselves. Sir, the conviction in my mind, and in that of my colleagues, is that John Daly was incapable of lending himself to the use of dynamite. The Government seem to think that their Local Government Bill will pacify Ireland. They will find their mistake later on. The whole voice of the Irish Representatives demands the release of these men. It would be a graceful act, and would help to prevent the recurrence of bad feeling, if these unfortunate men were restored to their families. Before sitting down I should like to ask the Home Secretary what has become of a man named McKevitt, who was convicted at Liverpool, and whose name appeared in the previous, but not in the last, Return, presented to this House?

(7.30.) MR. SEXTON (West Belfast): I regret the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Exchange Division, and I do not think it can have been well considered. He takes up an indefensible position—that of an Opportunist. His question has merits of its own, and ought to be considered by itself, and without relation to any other question. The hon. Gentleman would postpone the granting of an amnesty until the granting of Home Rule. Sir, the main justification for both is the promotion of harmony between the two peoples. Why not begin to promote that harmony now?

*Mr. Patrick O'Brien*

Why delay it because another measure will be introduced a few years hence? The hon. and learned Gentleman says this is not the proper time. I think it is. These criminal acts were the result of the passions which grew out of the agrarian struggle in Ireland, which was a struggle for life. The general features of that struggle were exaction, eviction, terrible suffering, terrible reprisals, and the emigration or banishment of a great number of people to America, where, no doubt, the passion that induced these acts was fed. Ever since 1885 Governments have been engaged in promoting a condition of things by which they hoped to put an end to the older system that engendered these acts of violence. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Exchange Division, as a constitutional lawyer, and as a student of constitutional history, knows that it is in conformity with the practice of the whole civilised world to apply the principles of amnesty when the crimes which have grown out of a fierce political struggle have ceased. Sir, it is only by a political accident that the present Home Secretary is the Imperial administrator in whose hands lies the power of exercising the clemency of the Crown. He was first sent to this House because of his appeal to revolutionary passion. He was able to retain the seat he first obtained by just those appeals to revolutionary feeling to which the British critics of Irish affairs object; and if he had been able to hold the seat for Dungarvan in 1874, or to win it in 1876 or 1880, it is open to me to assume that the right hon. Gentleman might have been found on our side to-night. That he is not on our side arises not from the merits of the case, but from the chances of his political fortunes. Sir, I think our appeal may be addressed with particular force to an English Parliament. Remember the part you have played. The writings and the speeches of your public men have done much to stimulate political crime. Your sympathy with political struggles has been responsible in a great measure for the propagation of political crime in Europe. When the acts are committed against your own Parliament, the rights and duties of

ence entitle you to regard it a different point of view; but I ntitled to argue that you should der the political passion that gave o the criminal acts—at least, in natter of the amount of punish- . In granting an amnesty you of course, bound to consider the of public feeling, and I do not re that the state of public feeling ngland is adverse. I know that e feeling in Ireland is ardently in r of an amnesty. Conventions , with the direct sanction and ap- al of the Bishops, been held all Ireland, attended by delegates; at these great Conventions resolu- have been passed, that in view of loubt of guilt in some cases, the ; and excitement in all, and the it to which punishment has pro- ed, it would be desirable and wise xtend clemency to these men. fuse to attach much importance e letter mentioned in connection the prisoner Daly, and I say that whole tenor of his life showed that as aversive to crimes of this descrip-

There are many circumstances h surround his case with an sphere of considerable doubt. right hon. Gentleman has been d again and again to say who gave bombs to Daly, and he has never rered the question, but has rather ously evaded the point. It is ; possible the bombs may have got Daly's possession without any y intention on his part, and the rnment are bound to state who the man who gave them to Daly der that we may judge whether or Daly may not have so taken them.

Police Superintendent, Farndale, it to have been examined at the , where it should have been ght out on what grounds he came e conclusion that the Irish police ted the bombs on Daly; and till know on what grounds he made startling statement, the question e guilt of John Daly will continue e surrounded by suspicion. With rd to Egan, there is nothing in his which is not compatible with eance. You owe Egan something e than justice, for you owe him ement, and I submit that public ion will very speedily compel the

OL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

release of Egan, and will eventually lead to the release of Daly. As to other cases, I say generally that these trials were held at a time of helpless panic. The reason of men was weakened by a political conflict, and it is saying nothing more against Englishmen than might be said against others, that at such a time verdicts of conviction were delivered upon evidence which would at any other time have been received with doubt, and sentences were passed which would have been deemed excessively severe. These Irish prisoners have suffered at least as much as ordinary convicts in the same time, and the nine years of their imprisonment have been equal to eighteen years under the ordinary law, and approaching that period of twenty years which, according to the usage of the English convict establishments, is equivalent to a sentence for life. The majesty and the power of the law have been amply vindicated, and the deterrent effect is complete; and, therefore, the point of punishment has now been reached where this prolongation may defeat your purpose. There are two options before you. By accepting this Amendment the majesty of the law will be vindicated, and you could promote the public interest by granting the the amnesty asked for, and at the same time conciliating the feelings of twenty millions of Irish people who live under the flag of Great Britain or the flag of other countries. But the Government appear to adopt the option of enforcing to the full the sentence of the law, and keeping these fifteen wretched men in the horrors of penal servitude until they drive them into the lunatic asylum or lay their bodies in the grave. Such a policy is unworthy of a great nation, and is open to the imputation most repugnant to the natural feelings of Englishmen—that of vindictive cruelty; and I say that if an Irish Government under similar circumstances held fifteen wretched Englishmen in their power, they would be perfectly ready to adopt the course which I now recommend to you.

(7.45.) MR. J. NOLAN (Louth, North): Last evening it was said by an hon. Member that we on this side of the House knew something about penal servitude. I think that, in the interests

Q



of justice, it would not be a bad thing if some of us knew a little more about it, and I certainly believe that at least two of the speeches during this Debate would not have been made if it were a rule of this House that the Home Secretary, before attaining that position, should undergo say eight years or so of penal servitude. With regard to the speeches of the Home Secretary, I desire to direct attention to his remarkable statement that if there was any reason to suppose that a member of the English or Irish police had supplied the bombs to Daly, it would be so infamous an action that Daly should not be kept any longer in prison, and that the most ample apology would be made, while compensation would be given to him; but I should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether he has any doubt upon that point, when the Chief Constable of one of the greatest cities in this country has announced his solemn conviction that those bombs had been planted upon Daly by the Irish police. If Mr. Farndale was guilty of bringing this charge improperly against the Irish Police, he should not keep the position he at present holds; and it will be easy to bring a charge of conspiracy against the Irish police officers, and on the *prima facie* evidence of Mr. Farndale to arrive at the truth. The right hon. Member for Derby and the Home Secretary say they have made inquiries, but of whom? There is a slang term in use to the effect that if you want to know anything you must "ask a policeman," and they have asked the police, against whom this charge was made, whether they were guilty or not! Of course the police said they were not guilty; and they professed to have a letter written to Daly which was accepted as conclusive evidence by the right hon. Gentleman at the time when Mr. Richard Pigott was in full bloom. In the interests of justice I unite my voice with the voices of those who have already spoken in this Debate, and those of the vast millions of our fellow-countrymen throughout the world, in asking that the cases of our imprisoned countrymen may be reviewed.

(7.53.) MR. ABRAHAM (Limerick, West): I do not intend to stand

*Mr. J. Nolan*

between the House and the division for more than a few moments, but I wish to say that I had the pleasure of being the friend of Mr. John Daly, and I desire to join with my colleagues in the appeal they have made for his liberation, and for a reconsideration of the cases of those prisoners. It is idle to tell us that these men are not political prisoners, for it is the conviction of every section of the people of Ireland that they are, and we shall continue to bring that view before this House again and again until you are convinced not only of the justice of our demand, but also that in the interests of peace you should liberate these men. I wish to say that in the year 1886 John Daly was afflicted with a grievous disease, and I applied to the Home Secretary for a special inquiry into his case. I am glad to bear testimony to the courtesy received from the right hon. Gentleman on that occasion. As I sat by the bedside of John Daly, and when I believed he would never again stand upon his feet, John Daly, on what I looked upon as his deathbed, said that he had no sympathy with dynamiters, and that he was a victim of the police. That statement convinced me of his innocence, and I feel that I shall be false to my friendship with him if I do not state that in the presence of the Tory Party and of our Liberal friends above the Gangway. I believe in the innocence of that man, and when I see to what a wreck John Daly has been reduced by your prison treatment, I feel that he has been more than punished for the crime alleged against him.

(7.57.) MR. O'KEEFFE (Limerick): As I am a representative of Limerick, the city in which John Daly was born, in which for years he earned his bread by the exercise of an honourable trade, in which his character was well-known, and in which his sufferings are deeply regretted, I wish to say that the majority in that city are fully convinced of his innocence of the foul crime of which he was accused. He was a man who had held, before this, control over the working classes of the place, and he had been engaged, just before he fell into this terrible predicament, in advancing the constitutional agitation of that time; while he was a prime

mover in obtaining the election to this House of that illustrious Irishman, Isaac Butt. I do not desire to go into all the arguments of the case, but we do believe in his innocence, and the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford has the support of all the people in that part of Ireland which I have the honour to represent. If my hon. Friend has established his first principle, that the offence of which Daly was found guilty was a political offence, the necessity for the reconsideration of his case, or total amnesty, ought to follow as the immediate corollary. When the Home Secretary read the indictments against these men he merely directed the attention of the House to the dynamite charges, and yet he withdrew the case from the specific statute and extended the charge into one of treason felony. Mark the injustice done to Daly by such legal chicanery. It has never been proved or insinuated that he did an act of violence to anybody or against any property; he was simply in possession of explosives, for which under the specific statute he was only liable to 14 years, but on the charge of treason-felony he was liable to penal servitude for life. The hon. Member for Waterford has proved his case conclusively, and I heartily join in the appeals that have been made for the reconsideration of the case. I do not think a more opportune moment will arise for the exercise of that mercy of which the Crown is the fountain. There is no hope for these men in this world, no rest for them except in the grave, and we ask you to grant our appeal, and the people of Ireland will recognise that their still exists in the hearts of Britons a true feeling of fair play and justice.

The House divided:—Ayes 97; Noes 168.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

(8.50.) MR. HENRY LABOUCHERE (Northampton): During the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle an observation fell from him to the effect that he thought it indecorous that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham should occupy a seat upon the Front Opposition Bench, and

from that post of vantage make speeches against the Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman is not here, as I should like to know, but I suppose I shall find out, why he makes an observation like that, and why it elicits cheers from all parts of the House, when, as a matter of fact, an agreement was entered into at the commencement of the present Parliament, as I am credibly informed, between Lord Hartington and the leading Members of the Opposition that three seats should be reserved for the Liberal Unionists. I wish my right hon. Friend, or somebody on that bench, would make it clear to me whether that agreement was not entered into owing to the respect that we all felt for Lord Hartington, and whether, when Lord Hartington is removed to another House, the gentleman who is the Leader of the Liberal Unionist Party in this House and his supporters have a right to these seats. If that is so—if these seats have been conceded to them by some sort of arrangement, they are wise to occupy them. But I would have my right hon. Friend, the Member for Newcastle, seriously consider, after the cheers which his observations drew forth, whether they should not consider that that agreement was at an end, and whether they should not inform the Liberal Unionists that the three particular seats should no longer be reserved for them; that they must take their chance—though, of course, they might exercise their rights as Privy Councillors—and that if there were space available, they may sit down, but if there were not, let them seat themselves elsewhere. The Liberal Unionist Party is a curious Party, and the right hon. Gentleman a curious Party Leader. I understand that this Party entertains certain pious opinions in regard to Liberal Measures on the understanding that they are never to give effect to those pious opinions, because, strange to say, the duty that they owe to Liberalism is to maintain in power a Tory Government. Therefore I think they are a curious Party, and not only that, but that

they have a curious Leader. The Liberal Unionist Party is chiefly composed of Whigs, as they used formerly to be called, but are now termed "Moderate Liberals," and it is curious that this section of Moderate Liberals should choose as their Leader a gentleman who passed as one of the strongest Radicals in this House. I read with interest the account of the meeting at which the election of the right hon. Gentleman as Leader of the Liberal Unionist Party took place. I find that the right hon. Gentleman not only does not agree with us, not only does not agree with the pious opinions of Gentlemen opposite, but that when he was elected Leader of this small Party he claimed the right not only to act as Leader, but also to act in his individual capacity when he differed from those whom he led. In that case, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will tell us, when he gets up to speak, whether he is speaking as a Liberal Unionist, or in antagonism to the views of his own little Party. I observe that the usual course in the Debate on the Address has been entirely reversed. I have had the pleasure of listening to a great many Debates upon Queen's Speeches, and, as a rule, Ministers always complained of the length of the discussion, and that the Debate was not kept within the four corners of the Queen's Speech. But what is done at the present time? We have had the Members of the Government getting up and bitterly complaining that there has not been a sufficient amount of discussion, not only on things in the Speech, but on things out of the Speech. If we were to follow the suggestions of hon. Members opposite I am certain the discussion would last two or three months. The First Lord of the Treasury was the first to suggest this Donnybrook Fair idea when he complained that the Member for Derby did not state his views and the views of his Party upon the question of Egypt. Now I look to the Address, and in the Address there is the mere announcement that one Khedive has died and that he has been succeeded by another; and the usual complimentary phrases are used in regard to succession; but yet the Leader of the House called upon the Member for Derby to state his views, not only

upon Egypt, but upon many other matters, and then he turned round and complained bitterly of my right hon. Friend for daring in this House to call attention to a statement made by the Prime Minister upon a public platform in Exeter. The view of the right hon. Gentleman is that Lord Salisbury is a member of the House of Lords, and that if any ground for complaint is to be had he should be brought to account in the House of Lords, and that we have no right to protest. I consider myself there are a great many objections to a Prime Minister being a member of the House of Lords. Ministers are made and unmade in this House; Ministers owe their allegiance to this House, and the opinion is growing in the country that the Prime Minister of this country, the man who is responsible for the policy, and chooses the policy which he thinks the country should pursue, ought to be in this House. The objections to the Prime Minister being in the House of Lords would be considerably aggravated if the doctrine of the Leader of the House is to be accepted, that we in this House are not to venture to call in question any language used by the Prime Minister upon a public platform on public affairs. I do not complain of the First Lord of the Treasury defending Lord Salisbury; every consideration would suggest his doing so, and there is every reason why he should say "ditto" to everything said by the Prime Minister. For my part, I think the language complained of by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was most ill-advised. I think it was unstatesmanlike, and I think it was indecent, because it tried to perpetuate all those religious animosities which every statesman should try to put an end to, and which have been the curse of Ireland. When the Prime Minister made those charges against the Catholics of Ireland, I cannot help remembering that if the Catholics were to reply, the Catholics would get the better of him by the mere recital of facts, because the action of Protestant England towards the Catholics of Ireland year after year has been a disgrace to her escutcheon. I am glad my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby dissociated the Liberal Party from all connection with

*Mr. Henry Labouchere*

language used by Lord Salisbury. I do not say I am sorry that Lord Salisbury used such language. I am sorry when political opponents make a mistake; and I think this age shows to what contemptible intents the political Leader of the Government is reduced in order to gain the ill-feeling which has so existed between this country and Egypt. Then we had another speech by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who cited the example of the First Lord of the Treasury. He favoured us with a speech upon Egypt. I am not to follow the right hon. Gentleman upon his speech, because I think all have plenty of opportunities, better opportunities than a general one on the Address, to discuss the question of affairs in Egypt. But, at I may say that I am glad that the hon. Gentleman did at last favour his views on that subject. He was to remain there as long as he existed from foreign invasion. We know that there is always a danger of an invasion from the southern front and that danger from foreign invasion will perpetually exist; and if, more, we are to remain there until the day of foreign invasion has passed, practically our occupation is to last forever. [Mr. J. W. MACLURE (Leicestershire): Hear, hear.] I have doubt that is the view of many hon. Members opposite, and I congratulate the hon. Gentleman opposite for the honesty of his opinions. It has been asserted that the right hon. Member the Member for Midlothian was in favour of scuttling out of Egypt at a moment's notice, and words were cited out of a speech by the right hon. Gentleman's to which interpretation was given; but I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman meant that we should go out of Egypt without due consideration. I think what the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to convey, and what he meant, was that we should inaugurate a sort of negotiation with the Khedive with the intention of getting out as soon as possible. That is the Liberal Policy, whereas the policy of the Tories is that we should remain in Egypt as long as we could.

The distinction between the Tory Policy and the Liberal Policy in Egypt is this—the Tory Party desire to remain in Egypt as long as possible, the Liberal Party are anxious and willing at all times to remain in Egypt as short a time as possible. After this jingo blast about Egypt, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham goes on to complain that we had not started a Home Rule Debate on these Benches. If he had looked at the notice paper he would have seen that the hon. Member for West Belfast has put down an Amendment which will no doubt raise an interesting Debate with regard to the policy of the Government with reference to Home Rule and Local Government. But really it is astounding that the right hon. Gentleman should have renewed in this House a demand which he has made for the last six years consistently, and that the hon. Gentleman opposite should have read so little of the speeches out of this House, that he should have pleaded it as a new argument now against the Opposition. He said the Members of the Opposition should state what their Bill would be if they came into power. Well, I hope they will come into power on a day not long distant, and if the hon. Gentlemen are here they will hear the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for Midlothian, state what it will be, and if they are not here they will have an opportunity of reading it in the newspapers the next morning. To whom do we owe allegiance? We owe allegiance to the Liberal party, and the Liberal party do not wish the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to impose his will upon us. We do not want the right hon. Gentleman to tell us how we should conduct the business of Opposition. We will leave him to tell the Government how to carry on the business of the Government. We look to our constituencies; we look to the Liberal Party, and we find the other day that in Rossendale, where a vast number of people had been led astray in 1886, they had returned to the fold, and were perfectly satisfied with our way of presenting Home Rule to them, and they gave a very large majority to the gentleman who represented the policy of

the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. There was one interesting fact which I gathered from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. It was that the right hon. Gentleman had a plan of his own to give a Legislative Assembly to Ireland; but what I heard for the first time was, that as his plan had been scoffed at on all sides, the right hon. Gentleman had come to the conclusion that in order to punish the Irish for his plan being scoffed at they were never to have, with the aid of the right hon. Gentleman, a Legislative Assembly in Ireland. A more modest observation, and an observation which shows more clearly that the right hon. Gentleman has been actuated by principle, and not by personal feeling, I never heard in this House. It has been often laid down that it is not necessary to protest against anything in the Queen's Speech to retain one's opinion with regard to it—that assent to the Queen's Speech binds no one to anything. While I agree, of course, to the first paragraph in the Queen's Speech, which refers to the death of the Duke of Clarence, I should have preferred that all the other paragraphs had been left out. This Parliament is in the sere and yellow leaf; it is suffering from the paralysis of old age; and it also suffers from the fact that not only is it a very old Parliament, but a very discredited Parliament, and there is no reason to doubt that it does not enjoy the confidence of the country. For my part, I only regard ourselves as walking and talking corpses, and I think the only fit place for us is the grave. Instead, therefore, of having a number of Bills mentioned which the Government will never carry, I should have preferred that there had been only one paragraph in the Address, stating that there would be a Vote on Account taken, and then an immediate Dissolution. I read an article in the *Times* on the first day of this Session, in which it said: "The atmosphere is heavy with the weight of a Dissolution." I should have thought that the only way to have the atmosphere cleared of the weight of a Dissolution was to have a Dissolution. The *Times* did not say this; but it must have occurred to everyone who agrees with the *Times*

*Mr. Henry Labouchere*

that the best way to clear the atmosphere was to have a Dissolution. The Duke of Devonshire, in 1880, asserted that Members cannot perform their duties with an election hanging over them. He said then that Ministers were bound to dissolve, that Parliament had lasted long enough; and Ministers then agreed with him, because very shortly afterwards Sir Stafford Northcote said they would dissolve, and a Dissolution took place in April. Lord Salisbury said in 1884 that a Minister has no right, even though he has a majority in Parliament, to impose his will on the country, and say, "so long as I have a majority in the House of Commons I will not dissolve." But when I say that there is a reasonable probability that Ministers have lost the confidence of the country I do not go far enough, because really, practically, the leaders of the Government have admitted themselves that they have lost the confidence of the country. I have read with interest a good many speeches that have been delivered by Ministers during the Recess, and I observed that the main staple of their speeches was explaining to their friends that even if beaten at the next General Election, yet they would not lose all hope. It seems to be accepted as a certainty that their political death will take place at the election. ("No!") The hon. Gentleman says no, but I prefer to take a reasonable deduction from the observations of the hon. Gentleman's own leaders rather than from the almost inarticulate observations of the hon. Gentleman. They consoled their followers by saying that after the Dissolution there would be some sort of resurrection, and that they might not lose all hopes of winning at some future time. Can the hon. Gentleman conceive the general of an army going into battle telling his soldiers that they were certain to be beaten on that day, but that he hoped on some future day to re-establish matters by another battle. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle asked what assurance have we that this would be the last Session. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham told us this would be the last Session. The right hon. Gentleman, I observed, during his speech is—

repetually speaking of "we," by which, no doubt, he meant Lord Salisbury and himself, a sort of *Ego et rex* us; but I should like to know whether he was speaking with authority in this matter. But I go further, and I say that I think we should not sit till the end of the Session. I think Easter would be a very good time for the Dissolution, and I ask the Government to consider it. I think they have already considered

It seems to me that they do not believe they are likely to pass much of the legislation which they have put in the Queen's Speech. I think their programme is something of an electioneering recital. We are told that a District Councils Bill would be brought in, but that it was by no means certain that they would have time to pass it. We know perfectly well what that means. Why, that Bill has been given up already. Then the Small Holdings Bill is promised. Why, Lord Salisbury has gone out of his way to sneer at his own Bill. Then we are told we are to have a Church Discipline Bill. Do Lord Salisbury and his Friends think that they will pass a Church Discipline Bill without the most strenuous opposition? We on this side of the House don't want to have the State interfering and giving powers to bishops over clergy, or to clergy over bishops. We want an absolute separation of Church and State, and I think that is the view we will adopt when the Bill is brought to the House. But I don't think it will pass, or that it is likely to be discussed. And then we are told that we are to have an Irish Local Government Bill; and in reference to this Irish Local Government Bill I must call attention to the wonderful character of the Tory Party. It will be remembered that we had a sort of Liberal Parliament at Newcastle, where leaders and followers all agreed on the policy that ought to be pursued. The Tory Party allowed suit. They had a Tory Parliament in Birmingham. The first thing that happened was that a Gentleman on that side of the House representing the Government got up and moved a resolution in favour of Irish Local Government. What happened? With one voice these delegates of the

Tories all over the country declared that they would have nothing whatever to do with the Bill. They protested against it, and a gentleman moved "the previous question." The feeling was so strong that the gentleman who brought the motion forward accepted "the previous question." If these are the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite I do not think the Government can be very serious in their statement of intention to bring in a Local Government Bill. One thing I am perfectly certain of, if they bring in the Bill it will be a most absolute and thorough sham. They tell us that the second reading is not to be moved till after Easter. I suppose they hope by that time to reconcile their recalcitrant followers to the Bill. The only way they can do that is by telling them that the Bill is a mere sop brought in because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham insists upon it, but that the Bill will mean nothing and give nothing in the shape of Local Government. I think I am right in saying that there is nothing in this programme to galvanise this moribund assembly into life. The fact is the country is absolutely sick of the present system of Government—supported by two Parties, but ending in this unilateral legislation. You bring in Bills labelled Liberal Bills. Why do you do that? In order that Liberal Unionists might support them, and then the Liberal features are cut out of them in order that you may get your Tory friends to vote for them. The Prime Minister has said that the measures of the Government may be considered by the Liberal Unionists as Liberal measures and by the Tories as Conservative measures. He might have just as well said that you are to consider a man black or white, as you please. I am perfectly certain that I am not only enunciating the views of hon. Members on this side of the House, but the views of hon. Members on both sides of the House when I say that neither Liberals nor Tories relish this sort of mulatto legislation. Let us do away with sham and humbug by bringing forward Bills which appear Liberal Bills to the Liberals and Tory Bills to the Tories. I, for my part, urge the General Election in the interests of all,

and not alone in the interests of those who agree with my political views. No one can possibly say that this Government unquestionably possesses the confidence of the country. So far as we know, where the country has been consulted, the Ministers have certainly not received that amount of confidence which would ensure them the confidence of the country. If the country is with the present Unionist Government then, surely, an election would strengthen them. Just think! When they were opposed on these Benches after the election, then they could say: "You urged our appeal to the country. We have appealed to the country, and we have been sent here with a majority at our back." Why, they would be able to tramp upon us and treat us as microbes or any such pernicious organisms. On the other hand, if they had not a majority of the country, surely it is better in the interest of representative government that the Ministers here should be backed up by the country. Every one admits that the Government here ought to be a reflex of the majority of this House; but it is also true that the majority of this House should be a reflex of the majority outside this House. I do trust that the First Lord of the Treasury will rise above the mere wishes of perhaps some of his colleagues, to retain place and power and salary for a little time; that he will take a large patriotic view of his duties and responsibilities as the Leader of this House, that he will not waste time—a year—on mere electioneering discussions in this House, but will, as speedily as possible, propose a Vote on Account—and I am sure the House would offer no opposition to it—and come down to this House and say: "In view of its being doubtful that we have the confidence of the country, in view of the Resolution carried at the Conference of Birmingham followers against our policy, we will appeal to the country and abide by the issue."

(9.25.) MAJOR FREDERICK C. RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I regret that in the addresses of the Mover and Seconder of the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech no mention whatever was made of the Labour Question, and particularly to that part of the Labour

Question which refers to the 30,000 or 40,000 able-bodied men who are discharged from the Army every year, and thrown upon the country without any employment whatever. I have referred to this subject before in this House, and received sympathetic support from hon. Gentleman on the opposite side of the House, below the Gangway. I think the justification of any remarks of this kind is accentuated by the Report, which will be in the hands of hon. Members shortly, and which has been published by the Inspector of Recruiting, by which it appears that during the year just past something like 4,600 had deserted, a larger number than in any year since 1887; and that it has been found still harder this year than last year to fill up the ranks of recruits. I think that a matter like this ought at any rate to temper the post-prandial speeches of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, and I cannot help thinking that this is a phase of the Labour Question, which, considering that it affects thirty or forty thousand men annually, the Government might very well see cause to take up.

(9.27). MR. ALPHEUS C. MORTON (Peterborough): I agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite who has just sat down that something ought to be done with regard to the Labour Question, not only with regard to that particular part of it he mentioned, but with regard to the Labour Question generally. I do not think I would have attempted to occupy the time of the House if it had not been for the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham yesterday. I do not wish to criticise that speech, but I gathered during the first two evenings of the Debate on the Address that it was the general intention that a Vote should be taken as soon as possible, because there would be other opportunities in which all these matters could be discussed.

*Mr. Henry Labouchere*

The Members of the Opposition have been challenged to discuss the Queen's Speech by the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for West Birmingham. I do not know whether he was put up by the Government with the view of occupying the time of the House, and doing what is known as obstructing, for the purpose of getting the Government more time to bring in their Bills. I have no knowledge of that; but it may have been. It seems that the Government have no desire to bring in the Bills that they have given notice of. I entirely agree with the senior Member for Northampton that it would be wise for the Government to take a Vote on Account, and at once go to the country. I do not think they have courage to do that, but that is what would suit the Radical Party in the country I am certain. Everybody agrees in sympathising with Her Majesty and the Royal Family in the lamented death of the Duke of Clarence. But I think the Government were wrong in advising Her Majesty as they did in the matter of Court mourning. I do not myself, nor can anybody else, place the slightest value upon official mourning. If mourning is to be of any value it must be natural and done by the people without any order or command from the Government. Well, Sir, the consequence of this order for official mourning has been great distress to a large number of the people of this country. It has so disarranged a certain class of trade that a number of people have been driven into the workhouse. These unfortunate events may occur again, and I hope care will be taken that the poorest portion of the industrial classes is not allowed to suffer on account of what is called Court mourning. Now, Sir, as regards Egypt, no one in the Radical Party ever expressed a wish that in the course of 24 hours our troops should be removed from that country. What we have said is this—that the Government should come to terms with France,

who have some interest in the matter, and to whom we have made promises. The people of France, in making that Canal, did more for Egypt and the world than any other country, and they may be fairly said to have a large interest there. If it is the intention of any other country permanently to occupy Egypt, France may be pardoned if she feels injured. Subject to a proper arrangement with Egypt itself, the general feeling of this country is that we should get rid of the trouble and expense of governing Egypt, and leave it to govern itself. As regards the Newfoundland Fisheries, the reason the Government are unable to settle this unfortunate question by compensation or otherwise is on account of the Egyptian difficulty. The moment you get rid of that difficulty you will be able to come to terms with France in regard to the fishery dispute. We are told in the Queen's Speech that the Government have come to some understanding with the United States for the settlement of the Behring Sea dispute by arbitration. I am very glad to hear that, and I hope the time will come when our Government may enter into negotiations with other countries for the settlement of all disputes that may hereafter arise by arbitration rather than by war. Sir, we are told that the Estimates have been prepared with a due regard to public economy. I hope the Government in that matter will carry out their promise better than they have hitherto done. In the second place, I hope they will be more prompt in the presentation of the Estimates. Last Session we had forced through this House in one night Estimates amounting to about £17,000,000 sterling. That is a scandal and a disgrace to any deliberative Assembly. The next point is as to the general principles affecting Local Government in Ireland. We have heard that the Conservative Party are opposed to Local Government in Ireland. Personally, I am very glad the Government should ask us to consider this Bill, because it shows that they have altered their policy altogether



According to Lord Salisbury, Ireland it was only after that that we were told we might consider whether we should give her Local Government. The Government now admit they were wrong, and they propose to allow the Irish people to manage their own local affairs. If the Bill is an honest Bill, we shall support it. I read the promise of the Government to be this—that they mean to go as far as the English Bill; but if they would go a step further and present a measure drawn upon the lines of the Scotch Bill, I would be glad. As regards the Small Holdings Bill, I am afraid it will be of no use whatever unless there is introduced the principle of compulsion. I am glad to notice that the advantages of assisted education are to be given to Ireland. I never could understand why Ireland was left behind England in that matter except that it is the traditional policy of the Tory Party to keep the people in ignorance. I notice the Solicitor General laughing, but the hon. and learned Gentleman knows as well as I do that the Tory Party is opposed to education; he knows that, if the Tory Party could have stopped them, there would have been no educational grants and no school books. Now, Sir, with regard to the Private Bills Procedure Bill, we have heard something of the same kind before, so far as Scotland is concerned, and Scotland would have nothing to do with the Bill. They said that any body appointed to dispose of Scotch Private Bills should be a representative body, and not a body selected by any Government. Therefore, if the Scotch Bill is on the same lines as that of last year, it will not be satisfactory to the people of Scotland. What the Scotch people want is Home Rule, and I am glad to see the Member for North Aberdeen (Mr. Hunter) has introduced a Bill to give the Scotch people control of their own affairs. That will be better than anything the Government can do, and I therefore hope they will withdraw their Bill and support the measure introduced by the hon. Member for North Aberdeen. Sir, we are told the Government mean to introduce a Bill for the improvement of the Legislative Councils of India; but unless the Bill gave the people of India

some popular representation on these Councils, it will be of no use whatever. The moment you get the people with you, you need not fear any interference from Russia or from any other Power. There ought to be no difficulty in giving the people of India a share of the government of their own country. I should like to see the Government taking a more active part about the opium and salt traffic. As regards the opium traffic, which we maintain for money-making purposes, it is a scandal and a disgrace to the people and the Government of this country. Professing, as we do, to be a religious people, with a large number of Bishops, and so on, we ought to be ashamed of the misery that we cause by the use of that opium drug simply to make money, and for no other purpose whatever. I confess I do not understand the next clause in the Queen's Speech, relating to the relief of public elementary schools from the pressure of local rates. That does not affect the Board schools. If I understand it at all, it is an attempt to relieve denominational schools at the expense of others, and will not be viewed with any favour by the Radical Party, unless you are prepared to give us that local control of these schools which we claimed last year, and which will have to be given as soon as the next General Election occurs. Sir, we are told that the Government propose to introduce a Bill for the improvement of the discipline of the Established Church. That is a small matter which the Government might well have left alone. I am glad to know, as a member of the Church of England, and a churchwarden, that this Church Discipline Bill is not required, and I ask the Government to drop it, and to take up the question of the amendment of the laws with regard to betting and gambling. It is admitted by everybody, by the ministers and clergy of the Church of England, and ministers of all denominations, to be a most pressing and important question, and I would urge the Government to make an honest and determined attempt to stop betting and gambling in this country; but, above all, we must take care that we do not give the moral sanction of this House to betting, by adjourning for the Derby Day. We

*Mr. Alpheus C. Morton*

ave been told something about a proposed arrangement with the Bank of England, which I suppose means £1 notes. So far as I can gather from business people, especially in the City of London, they are all against them. Abroad, every attempt to make cheap money has been a failure, and before they endeavour to introduce a £1 note in this country, the Government should take care that the *bona fide* business interest of the City of London is with them rather than against them, as it is at the present moment. I was sorry that the subject of the management of the water supply of London was left out of the Queen's Speech. We are told that there is to be a Commission; but I do not understand that, for the County Council and the Corporation of London believe they will have the support of the Government if they introduce a Bill during the present Session. The effect of this announcement, as to the appointment of a Royal Commission, will be to put the matter off for two or three years. We ought now to be able, in the City of London, to have pure water at a fair price, and the time has arrived when we should demand a settlement of this question. As I said before, I should not have spoken in this Debate but for the challenge of the Member for West Birmingham, who should remember that we agreed with him in 1885 in the unauthorised programme which he then put forward. We agree with that programme still; but he has deserted it. I have no doubt he is considered to have made, last evening, an extremely clever speech; but that speech will not affect a vote in this House, nor in the country. It reminded me rather of those speeches I have heard in times gone by at the Cogers' Hall and other assemblies in Fleet Street, where the principal object of the speakers seemed to be to destroy each other rather than anything else. The Member for West Birmingham asks whether we have stood by our Radical principles; but we have done a great deal more than that. We have induced the right hon. Member for Midlothian to join us, and adopt our Radical programme. Therefore, we have decidedly gained by the loss of the Member for West Birmingham;

because we have lost what turned out to be a treacherous and bad leader and got the very best in the United Kingdom. We have in the Newcastle programme, or the Radical programme, nearly everything which was mentioned in the unauthorised programme of 1885, and we have got Home Rule besides. The sooner we have a Dissolution the sooner we shall get Home Rule for England, Ireland, and Scotland, and everywhere else, because the Home Rule principle is spreading now, and is demanded in every village and parish in the country, while they are demanding it for London. As the Leader of the House has returned to his place, I would ask him to accept the proposal of the Senior Member for Northampton, to take a Vote on Account, and go to the country. If you will do so speedily, he will have no need to force upon his unwilling Party Local Government for Ireland, or any other Liberal reforms which he would propose in view of a General Election. I must object to the observations of the Prime Minister with regard to our fellow-countrymen, the Irish Catholics; and I notice that he did not use such language in 1885, when he was expecting to get the support of the Irish Catholic Party. The Prime Minister complained that the Irish Catholics were in favour of the American Revolutionary War, 120 years ago. But the City of London was equally opposed to that cruel and criminal war; and if the Prime Minister wishes to make complaint against anyone, he should make it against the citizens of London. I am not at all afraid of what will happen at the next election: and all I say to the Government in conclusion is that they should bring it about as soon as possible, for if the Tory Party have got any opinions they ought to have the courage to go to the country.

\*(10.25.) SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University): I will not attempt to follow the hon. Member through all the questions dealt with in his speech; but with regard to the appointment of a Commission on the water question, as desired by the County Council of London, I must say we are grateful to Her Majesty's Govern-

ment for having acceded to our request in that particular. The hon. Gentleman entirely mistakes the object and scope of that Commission. It is not with regard to the Water Companies of London, but to the question of water supply, and the need of obtaining it from a wider area, and we do not think Her Majesty's Government have intended in any way to postpone the settlement of the question. The London County Council and the Corporation will proceed with the Bill before this House, which we trust will receive the support of Her Majesty's Government. We are anxious to carry the Bill, because in that case when the Commissioners make their Report we shall be in a position to act upon its recommendations, whatever they may be. The hon. Member who has just spoken says that Home Rule was in the Newcastle programme. It is perfectly true; but what we want to know is, what is the Home Rule in that programme? and upon that point we find it impossible to obtain any information.

MR. MORTON: Allow me to explain distinctly. It is that the Irish people shall have the management of what this House determines to be Irish local affairs.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: That is not at all clear to my mind. What are their local affairs? I want to know why are the people of London not to have equally the control of their own affairs?—and if the hon. Gentleman says that there is to be equal Home Rule throughout the United Kingdom, and that London and other counties in England are to have the same powers for their local affairs, without interference from the people of Scotland or Ireland, then I say that it is not Home Rule at all, but that it is a system of government such as they have in the United States, or Switzerland, which is Federalism, and not Home Rule. We know what are the opinions of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway on Home Rule. What we wish to know are the opinions of hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway; but when they go to the country they whittle away their Home

Rule until it becomes a mere matter of water and gas—especially gas.

MR. MADEN (Lancashire, Rossendale): The right hon. Member for the University of London is making a reference, I believe, to myself at Rossendale. He says that when they, the Opposition Party, go to the country, they whittle down their Home Rule scheme to gas, water, and electricity. I may say—("Order, order!")

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity of replying to the hon. Baronet when he has concluded his speech.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: I did not mention Rossendale; but the cap must have fitted, for the hon. Member has applied to himself that which I was stating generally. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham appealed very strongly to the Member for Newcastle to give us his views, because, with all respect to the hon. Members who have just spoken, what we really want to know are the views of the right hon. Gentlemen who sit upon that Front Bench. Does Home Rule practically mean separation, or is it merely gas? I must say I was very much astonished at the answer given by the hon. Member for Newcastle, who said he was not in a position, "on the spur of the moment, to give a better description of his policy" than a quotation from a former speech which he read. But we do not ask for his views on the spur of the moment. This is a great question which has been under serious consideration for months and years past, and we do not want to have any momentary expression of opinion from him. We want to know what are his deliberate convictions, and upon that point we certainly have not got any satisfactory answer. It is natural we should ask that question, which has been also so ably pressed by the hon. Member for East Fife, who has a burning desire for Home Rule, which is only equalled by his desire

*Sir John Lubbock*

I know what Home Rule is. Surely, the right hon. Gentleman below me will give an answer to the hon. Member for Fife and to the country, and when we know what they mean by Home Rule we can give it our serious consideration. I should like also to say a word or two in reference to another great question which certainly ought not to be a matter of party politics, and that is the question of our policy in Egypt. The hon. Member for Newcastle said he had never expressed an opinion in favour of immediate evacuation. That may be true, Sir, if you use the word in reference to a very short time, but the right hon. Gentleman said he hoped that we should be able to carry out that policy before the end of the Session. That is to say, it was a question of a few months. The hon. Member for Midlothian and his colleagues are responsible for our foreign policy in Egypt, and if we were to go out so soon as that, we ought never to have gone there at all. Why did we send troops there and spend millions of English money if we were at once coming away again? No doubt our position in Egypt to a certain extent is one of danger, but I maintain that, looking at its geographical position, anarchy and misgovernment of Egypt is a greater danger than our occupation of it, and therefore we should not be in a hurry to evacuate the country. My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby made some rather severe remarks on the gracious Speech from the Throne in reference to the Bank of England, and blamed the Chancellor of the Exchequer because "he produced an essay in some commercial circle where it was little understood." I think the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer before the Chamber of Commerce was very lucid, and well understood by the members. There is no more fitting place to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer could go

to lay his views before his fellow-countrymen on so important a subject, and I shall be expressing the views of the mercantile community when I say that we are obliged to him for coming there and explaining his views to us. We do not know exactly what course the Chancellor of the Exchequer has indicated in the Queen's Speech, but I presume that he does not intend to introduce any change in the currency of the country, as that would be a matter of such importance as to require a paragraph to itself in the Speech. The arrangements with the Bank of England, are of course, of importance also, but as several hon. Members have referred to measures they would have been pleased to see mentioned in the Speech, there is one subject I should have been glad to see in it myself. We hear a great deal about the hours of labour and an Eight Hours Bill; but there is a class of our fellow-citizens who are working twelve or fourteen hours a day, and I say this on the authority of the unanimous report of a Committee of this House specially appointed to go into the question. It reported that in many places small shopkeepers and shop assistants worked as much as eighty-four hours a week—that is fourteen hours a day. What makes it worse is that thousands and thousands of these persons are not strong men, but are young girls, and to have young girls standing for fourteen hours in a shop is perfectly ruinous to their health. Not long ago I presented a petition to this House, signed by the Presidents of the two great Medical Colleges, and more than half the leading medical men of London, calling attention to the great and sore injury done to the health of our young men and women by these long hours. I am happy to say this is no question of a struggle between class and class; the small shopkeepers are even more anxious than the shop assistants to see the hours shortened. What they ask is that the House shall give them the power to regulate the hours, which power they would have had in ancient times. Now, a minority, however small, can keep all the shops of a dis-

trict open. If the Government had inserted in the Speech some reference to this question, they would have been supported by the shop-keeping community, and by the Trades Councils, which, not only in London, but in several of our other large cities, have passed unanimous resolutions, calling the attention of the House to the subject. In the case of the London County Council, though we have many divergences of opinion, a unanimous resolution has been passed praying the House to intervene in the question. This is a matter which is ripe for solution, and any Government which will take it up will be taking up a subject which will be extremely popular in the country, and will have the general support of the shop-keeping community. If they will not deal with the matter themselves, I would earnestly appeal to them to support our endeavours to arrive at a solution of the question, and to let our Bill be referred to a Select Committee, where the whole question may be thrashed out. Sir, if we were to pass a Bill of this kind in the last Session of this Parliament we should have done a great and good work, and shall have carried a Bill which would conduce to the health and happiness of thousands and thousands of our fellow countrymen and women.

*\*(10.40.)* MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I think, Sir, although the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby referred rather happily to the many measures mentioned in the Speech as a "catalogue of remanets," those of us who have read it carefully will be of opinion that there are amongst them measures which will require very careful consideration. I might enforce my remark by pointing out that no less than ten of the measures passed last Session were measures amending Acts which had been passed by the present Parliament. I noted that the Mover of the Address said that the Small Holdings Bill would raise the whole question of agricultural depression. But there is a reference in the Speech to another Bill which has not yet received any attention—that which says a Bill will be laid before the House for relieving public elementary schools from the present

burden of the local rates. That is a Bill which will raise the whole question of the two classes of schools, voluntary and public elementary schools. Clearly in those two Bills we have matter for somewhat prolonged discussion. If any illustration be needed that an ample bill of fare is provided in the Queen's Speech, it will be found in the last item of the twelve in the programme—the Employers' Liability Bill. I shall have the assent of some of the supporters of the Government when I say that the reason why a very satisfactory conclusion was not arrived at in regard to the Bill of 1888 was that we were hurried into Committee without a proper Second Reading Debate. Most of us in the Grand Committee felt that the Home Secretary was not aware of the numerous points which were raised by the Bill. On Wednesday the Home Secretary used the expression, the hon. Member for Nottingham was personally responsible for the defeat of that Bill. The hon. Member needs no defence of his action from me. He feels extremely keenly on this matter; he was Secretary of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, and in every step he took he had full approbation of those whom he represented. But there were others in the Grand Committee who took the same course as he did in respect to the Bill, and I, for one, am willing to assume full responsibility in the matter. If the right hon. Gentlemen is unhappily inclined to bring forward a Bill of the same character it will probably share the same fate. The point really is whether the Bill shall be compulsory or not, and I believe it is a fact that those mainly interested have distinctly made up their minds that it will be practically worthless unless it be compulsory, as an Act of Parliament should be binding upon all. We are told, as usual, in the Speech that the estimates for the Public Services for the ensuing year will be laid before us; they have been prepared with a due regard to financial economy. I am not concerned to deny the statement that economy of time has not always been displayed in Committee. We shall all agree that this discussion of Supply is often

*Sir John Lubbock*

a most unsatisfactory character. A great deal of time is often spent on more or less microscopical points, which might have been saved for consideration of larger matters. What are the facts as to the manner in which the Estimates are brought forward? I will not weary the House in the figures which might be given on this point; I will take those of 1891. The House sat 140 days, and I will refer to the Civil Service Estimates and the Revenue Estimates. They amounted to 28 millions sterling. There were Votes on Account of eight millions taken on the 17th March and the 25th May, leaving 20 millions to be dealt with in Committee Supply. The first day the House went to Committee of Supply was the 1st April, the 57th day of the Session; on the 28th and 29th May, the fourth day not being till the 16th June, and on the 9th July. Of the 20 millions only £1,200,000 was voted in April, May, and June, and in July ten millions was voted for Civil Service and eight millions for the Revenue Estimates. That is to say, that 12 millions were voted in July, after the House had been sitting over a hundred days out of the hundred and forty. Therefore, out of each pound sterling the Committee voted of these estimates one and threepence in April, May, and June, and eighteen and ninepence in July. On the last day of July and the early hours of the first day of August ten millions were voted away. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is a very satisfactory method of conducting the business of Supply. A Committee on the subject in 1888, and made a very interesting Report, which might command the attention of the House. I doubt some of the suggestions are more or less drastic reforms, and they have been rejected to from various parts of the House, but I hope we shall have some early opportunity of discussing this matter at length. I hope also that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will give us some assurance that Supply will be brought forward early and at regular intervals, so that we may know where we are in this matter. The principal measure mentioned in the speech is undoubtedly the Bill for the

extension of Irish Local Government. The Government stands in a peculiar position in regard to this measure. It is practically six years since the Government promised an Irish Local Government Bill. When we met after the General Election in 1886 we heard the then Chancellor of the Exchequer getting up on behalf of the Government, with their approval, and use this language—

“I now come to the third question—that of Irish Local Government—on which I can only say that it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to devote the Recess, which we hope will be one of due length, to the careful consideration of the question of Local Government.”

and he goes on to say—

“And I may remind the House that it is not altogether without guidance as to the mind of the Government on this question, as the Queen's Speech announced their intention to introduce a Bill for extending Local Government in England as well as Ireland.”

He also said that simultaneity and similarity of treatment were, as far as possible, to be adopted in the development of a general and popular system of Local Self-Government in the four countries which make up the United Kingdom. Simultaneity has gone by the board, and we shall see how much of the similarity there is in these measures of the Government when we hear the explanation on the introduction of the Bill. I must say that, having regard to what I have called the attention of the House to, I was astonished to hear the First Lord of the Treasury use this language on Tuesday last when pressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, acting as Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. He said—

“He asks me whether the Irish Local Government Bill would be read a second time before Easter. It is impossible for me to give any absolute pledge upon that subject.”

And then, having given other reasons, he goes on to say—

“I should then hope that rapid progress would be made with the Bill of my right hon. Friend dealing with small holdings, which will be introduced as soon as this Debate is over, and that when it is not necessarily completed,

but as soon as it is in an advanced condition, I shall propose to give the Irish Local Government measure a Second Reading."

Surely a measure referred to in more than one Queen's Speech, and respecting which such pledges were given six years ago, should not take second place to a Small Holdings Bill which was only thought of the other day by the Government. (Cheers.) We are all aware that Irish Local Government is not Home Rule for Ireland (cheers); and I am speaking on behalf of my constituents when I assure hon. Members below the Gangway that nothing that has happened in Ireland within the last 12 months has in any way lessened our desire to do our part in securing for them a satisfactory measure of self-government (Cheers). We believe that it is only in that way that we can offer them some atonement for the wrongs of bygone years, wrongs inflicted upon their country by this country, and we hope and believe that now in a very short time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian will have the opportunity of inducing the House to sanction a measure which will at length bring happiness and prosperity to Ireland. (Cheers.)

(11.5.) Mr. J. G. SWIFT MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): Before referring to the Motion which stands in my name, I wish to make one reference to the speech of Lord Salisbury at Exeter, which has been so frequently alluded to in the course of this Debate. I must say that Mr. Lecky does not bear out the noble Lord in his remarks, and that it is proved by historical records that the Roman Catholics of Ireland took no part in the American War of Independence. Mr. Froude, whom I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will accept as an authoritative historian, deals with the question in the same manner. According to these authorities, it would appear that England, in the great War of Independence, had no fiercer enemies to contend against than the great grandsons of the Presbyterians of Ulster. One cannot help thinking that the near approach of the General Election must have

disturbed the historical recollections of the noble Lord, and that it was only these things which led him into the misstatements of matters that have been decided upon historical records. Having said so much upon a subject that has been referred to constantly in the course of the Debate, I will now proceed, with the permission of the House, to move the Amendment I have upon the Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment which appears on the Paper contains a number of subjects it would not be proper to move upon an Address to the Queen's Speech. What I wish to point out to the hon. Member is that some portions of his Amendment are not relevant.

MR. MAC NEILL: So you have explained to me, Mr. Speaker; and I have therefore altered the Amendment so as to meet your wishes, and I beg to move, as an addition to the Address, the following paragraph:—

"And we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Speech from the Throne contains no proposal for redeeming the pledges so frequently given by various Governments that natives of Great Britain and natives of India should be placed on terms of equality in the matter of appointments in the Public Service, and in facilities in competing for such appointments."

I may say that I am glad that my Amendment has been pruned, because it would be impossible for me, in the time I have at my disposal—with the permission of the House—to refer to the various subjects that occur upon the Address, and to which I would wish to refer. My object is to call attention to the enormity of the various grievances under which these 280,000,000, under control of the British Government, exist. I should state that in this matter the promises of the last half-century have been deliberately broken; that they have been broken over and over again, and I would remind the House that it has been over and over again stated, both in this House and by those at the head of the Indian Government, that there should be no distinction made in the matter of appointments between natives of India and natives of Great Britain—that all should compete upon equal terms in the matter of

those appointments. The Act of Parliament of 1833, in fact, states that no native of the territory of India, nor any natural-born subject, should, by reason only of his religion, &c., be disabled from holding any place in the Government of India. Fifty years after that Lord Salisbury talks about the "black man," and, forgetting the pledges that have been made to India, he practically repudiates all the engagements that have been previously entered into. Indeed, I do not see the use of his political hypocrisy about the people of India knowing that they are being "governed by a superior race," and in his regard I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement made by Lord Northbrook, who was speaking at Birmingham. He said—

"Let us never forget that it is our duty to govern India, not for our own profit and advantage, but for the benefit of the people of India."

This is the test which should apply to the Indian Question, and this simple test I place before the House with confidence, in the belief that it has not been met. How, I ask, has that duty, so specifically laid down in that sentence, been fulfilled by the English Government? How has it been carried out? Mr. Bright upon one occasion, expressing his opinions in language which was always expressive and to the point: Mr. Bright, long before he became a Liberal Unionist, said:—

"India has now become the pasture-ground for smart young English gentlemen."

Every office, every emolument worth having in India is given to Englishmen, and notwithstanding all the promises; and all the Acts of Parliament, the natives are, by various simple processes, boycotted and cheated out of everything in their own land. I have spoken about promises made in regard to India, and I think these promises, and the way they have been fulfilled, show that there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark." There was a promise made on the 1st of January by Lord Lytton. Lord Lytton has gone, and I do not wish to say much about him, for there is always respect in the minds of hon. Members, and of the nation, for those who have passed away; but this I will say, that I believe

there is no one who more threw himself into the arms of the official class than he did, and that he did it more than any other Indian Viceroy that we have known. He has assured us of the way in which the people are treated. There are other transactions to which, being of a personal nature, I do not wish to refer, but at all events we have it upon the most indisputable authority that—

"The natives of India, whatever their race or creed, have a recognised claim to share largely with their English subjects, according to their capacity, to the administration of affairs."

That was the public expression of opinion of Lord Lytton; but I should remind the House that the same opinion was expressed in private, as shown by the letter read from Lord Lytton by Mr. Bradlaugh in the Debate of 1888, Lord Lytton being then Ambassador in Paris, and in which he admitted that both the Indian Government and the English Government were unable to answer the charge of having broken the promises made. In fact, we have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them in regard to those appointments, and all the circumstances go to show that we have chosen the latter course.

We simply pay no regard to the promises that have been made by successive Governments in regard to Indian appointments. In 1853 there was a Commission of Inquiry into the state of India; the question of public competition was brought up, and the present Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, said it was simply absurd that native gentlemen should come over here and spend so many expensive years in trying to qualify for those appointments; that, in fact, it was as absurd and unfair to ask them to come to London and qualify as it would be to ask us to go to India and learn the language of Hindostan and to compete with them upon their own grounds. In 1860 there was at the India Office a departmental Civil Service inquiry, and in the Report that was issued from that inquiry the words of Lord Lytton are repeated; that we have really kept the promise to the ear and yet broken it to the faith. But that was not the only judgment



from high officials. In 1869 the Duke of Argyll was Secretary of State for India, and he also confesses that in the matter of appointments the natives had not been given a fair chance; that the promises which had been made to them had not been kept. I maintain that this is a very scandalous state of things, and that our Government in India savours too much of hypocrisy. Let us, I should say, tell the truth, and let us get rid of this hypocrisy by which we keep the natives of India out of appointments. In 1885 the number of the members of the Civil Service was 900, and only 9 were natives, it being shown that the returning from this country of candidates for appointment would tax any person other than those of independent means.

MR. CURZON: From what are you quoting?

MR. MAC NEILL: I am quoting from a speech made in September, 1885, in Birmingham, John Bright being in the chair, and the remarks relate to the higher branches of the Civil Service in India. It appears from that that there are 2,357 appointments; and that of all these offices, representing 282,000,000 of the Indian people, natives only held 188. It is, in fact, as difficult for natives to get an appointment in India as it has been for a Roman Catholic to get an appointment in Ireland; they are, in fact, weeded out of the national life and systematically and cruelly ignored. In 1886 it was stated that in the Province of Madras there was only three natives employed, so that we have treated India as we have treated Ireland, and just in the same sense as if it were an exaggerated Ireland. Lord Salisbury has said in 1883 that the Indians knew perfectly well that they were "being governed by a superior race," but I maintain that they are being cheated by that superior race, and that we deprive them of the means of appointment because we think them an inferior race. The India Office has promised to give this matter consideration, and I would ask the House to consider that the result of our interference in India is that we find the poorest people in the world saddled

*Mr. Mac Neill*

with the most expensive Government. If we govern India upon the principle of benefitting those who have charge of it, then let us say so; but, considering the enormous salaries we pay, and the fact that the Government of India is carried on for our own purposes, then let us make an end of the folly and hypocrisy of saying that we desire to give anything like preference to the appointment of natives. It would not have been necessary for me to move this Amendment if Mr. Bradlaugh had been here; but officials have taken advantage of Mr. Bradlaugh's death, and I must say that since 1888 the Government of India has shown itself cruel and heartless in this matter. I wish to say that, wanting Mr. Bradlaugh, we, the Irish Members, shall bring forward the question; and if we may not be able to remedy the grievances of the people of India, we will at least be able to ventilate their case before the English people. A deputation is coming over from India, and their voice, I can assure hon. Members opposite, will be heard at the approaching General Election.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question to add the words: "And we humbly regret that Your Majesty's Speech from the Throne contains no proposals for redeeming the pledges so frequently given by various Governments that natives of Great Britain and natives of India should be placed on terms of equality in the matter of appointments in the public service and in facilities in competing for such appointments."—(*Mr. Mac Neill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

\*(11.30.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. N. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The Amendment now moved by the hon. Member, whose courteous reference to myself I acknowledge, has assumed a very different form from that in which it first appeared on the Paper. In the form in which the notice appears on the Orders of the Day the Amendment commences by humbly representing to Her Majesty the views entertained by the hon. Member upon certain legislative proposals to be submitted to the House, and then goes on to complain of five alleged omissions from the

speech from the Throne. The first use of complaint is the absence of any reference to the *status* of Civil servants

India, the second has reference to the Opium Question; the third to the Salt tax; the fourth to the advancement of education, and the fifth to the development of the material and industrial resources of our Indian Empire. Well, when I read this catalogue of alleged omissions from the Queen's Speech drawn up by the hon. Member for South Down (Mr. Mac Neill), I confess I somewhat trembled to think what kind of a document a Queen's Speech would be if drawn up by the hon. Member. Likely it undoubtedly would be, whatever interest might be added to it by the fascinations of the hon. Member's wife. However, Sir, under your guidance the hon. Member has curtailed his Amendment, and has accordingly simplified my task, and imposed a less strain upon the time and attention of the House. It now falls to my duty to answer upon the particular point raised by the hon. Member, namely, the position of the Civil Service in India. The hon. Member complains that the Queen's Speech contains no proposals for redeeming the pledges so frequently given by successive Governments, that natives of Great Britain and natives of India should be placed on terms of equality in the matter of appointments in the Public Service. The hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by quoting the words of the well-known Statute of William IV. He quoted those terms correctly, and the inference he drew as to the obligations they impose on the British Government is perfectly correct. But when the hon. Member went on to say that the British Government had liberally broken faith, and when in speaking of the action of the British Government he used the word "hypocrisy" and other severe epithets, there I was compelled to meet him with an absolute contradiction. I hope I shall be able to show the House that the terms of the Proclamation of William IV. have been endorsed and ratified by successive Governments. When the

Queen took over the Government of India in 1858 her Proclamation in so doing contained an emphatic reiteration of the assurance, and ever since the Government of India has consistently and conscientiously made efforts to carry out that assurance. Since 1867 successive Viceroy's have considered means for utilising more and more the services of Indian subjects of Her Majesty in the higher appointments, and those efforts culminated during the administration of the late Lord Lytton, and in the creation in 1879 of the statutory Civil Service.

MR. MAC NEILL: I remember that, but I have referred to the letter from Lord Lytton.

MR. CURZON: But I am referring to something more than a private letter. I am referring to rules passed by Lord Lytton under a Statute on the Statute Book. I say, in 1879 Lord Lytton was responsible for the creation of the statutory Civil Service, and, under that scheme, one-fifth of the annual appointments to the Civil Service of India was reserved for natives of India, and without the disagreeable penalty of which the hon. Member has so severely complained, namely, the necessity of coming to England for the purpose of examination. It is perfectly true that the Queen's Speech contains no proposals with reference to the *status* of European and Native Members of the Indian Civil Service; and the reason is this, that the proposals to which the hon. Member alludes have become, or are in course of becoming, accomplished facts. I am loath to accuse the hon. Member of ignorance, yet I am compelled to think that he must be unaware of the progress of recent events in India. The Public Service there is undergoing a process of complete re-organization. But the hon. Member has never so much as alluded to the Public Service Commission which, a few years ago, was appointed in India.

MR. MAC NEILL: Yes, I know. Four years ago.

MR. CURZON: It was composed of representative and influential men, 15

in number. It contained five Civil servants, one representative of non-official Europeans, one representative of the Eurasians, one of the Uncovenanted Civil Service, and six representative native gentlemen. If the hon. Member appears to doubt or dispute the representative character of this Commission, let me mention the names of some of these native gentlemen. The name of Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, a Judge of the High Court, will be familiar to any one conversant with Indian affairs. He was a member of the Commission. The name of Raja Pertab Singh is well known, as is also that of Syad Ahmed Khan, the leader of the Mohammedan movement, and there was also an ex-Prime Minister of Baroda. This Commission appointed in 1886 carried on its investigations in India, and two years later a Blue Book was laid on the Table of this House, showing the steps proposed by the Secretary of State to carry out the policy in furtherance of which this Commission was appointed. And what were its proposals? This is a point the hon. Gentleman has entirely ignored, and if these matters were known to him I hardly think he could have made the speech he has just made. It is proposed to divide the Public Service as before into two branches, but both will be re-organised and rechristened. The first will be the existing Covenanted Civil Service, but under the new proposals this will be called the Imperial Service; it will be recruited by competition in England, and will be open, without distinction of race, to all natural-born subjects of Her Majesty. The second branch is to be called the Provincial Service, and will be recruited solely in India, and in each Province separately; on such terms as will attract local gentlemen possessing the necessary qualifications. Members of this Service will hold the higher appointments of the existing Uncovenanted Service, together with a certain number of appointments now reserved by law or practice to the Covenanted Service, which will be thrown open to the Provincial Service. And what is the character of the ap-

*Mr. Curzon*

pointments alluded to? At this moment, Sessions judgeships and collectorships of districts are reserved to the Covenanted Civil Service, but under the scheme of re-organisation about a third of the Sessions judgeships, and a sixth of the collectorships of districts, as well as other appointments, will be thrown open to the Provincial Service, which will be recruited, as I have explained, in India itself. The whole object of the proposals is to open up to natives of India a larger share of the higher-class appointments than they are now eligible for, and many of which are now reserved to the Covenanted Service. The result will be that not only will many more native gentlemen attain to positions of distinction, but there will be two branches of the Service—one recruited in England, the other in India, both being subject to regulations as to *status* and pay, which will apply equally to the European and Native members of these Services. But the point upon which the hon. Member laid particular stress was the hardship, as he considered it, of holding examinations for the Indian Civil Service in England. But he did not suggest any alternative scheme.

Mr. MAC NEILL: Oh, yes! The hon. Gentleman is perfectly well aware of the system of University examinations in various districts for various staff appointments, and similarly might examinations be held in different parts of India. I wish to simplify the hon. Gentleman. (Laughter.) I wish to simplify matters, and I may state that the International College last December passed a resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations being held, and that is the pith and gist of the whole matter.

Mr. CURZON: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for his desire to contribute towards my simplicity; he has equally contributed to my understanding. I think now I understand his point; he would have a system of simultaneous examinations in India. But is he aware that this point was discussed, analysed, examined, and reported upon by the Commission to which I have referred?

MR. MAC NEILL: I know that.

MR. CURZON: The Public Service Commission, the representative character of which I have explained, and which included native gentlemen of great position, unanimously decided against a system of simultaneous examinations in India. They reported that—

"An open competition in India for the Covenanted Civil Service would operate with inequality, excluding altogether some important classes of the community while giving undue advantage to others. The question is simply one as to the qualifications required, and the arrangements under which officers possessing such qualifications can best be secured. The object of the Government of India in recruiting in England a limited staff of officers, who, after a training in India, might be entrusted with the more executive and judicial charges, was (*inter alia*) to secure an administration conducted so far as possible on principles and by methods in harmony with modern civilization."

The hon. Member will find this in the Blue Book for 1888. I would also draw attention to the fact that three of the principal native members of the Commission, while they did not altogether share the apprehensions of their colleagues as to the probable results of simultaneous examinations in India and the United Kingdom, yet said that the scheme unanimously recommended by the Commission—

"was well calculated to secure for India the object they had in view, and was not open to the objections urged against simultaneous examinations in England and India."

I may further point out that the objection raised to the limit of age imposed on natives of India coming to England for examination has been removed, that limit having been raised from 19 to 23 years, which undoubtedly provides greater facilities to Natives to come over to compete. But on the general question I have still to meet the hon. Member. From his speech it might be inferred that the natives of India bear a small and wholly disproportionate part in the administration of their country. The hon. Member, with a rhetorical hyperbole derived from his native country, spoke of the natives of India being "boycotted" out of all employment, and then he proceeded to give figures to the House which it will fall to my lot to upset. I

doubt if the House has any idea of the number of natives usefully occupying permanent posts in the Public Service of India. Facts and figures outweigh much declamation; and the exact proportion is as follows. I take, first, the Uncovenanted Civil Service, and here the hon. Gentleman was quite unconsciously guilty of an inversion of figures at which the House will be surprised. He told us on the authority of a speech which, I think, he said was an electioneering speech, that the proportion in the Uncovenanted Service of Europeans to the natives of India was, in 1885, Europeans 2,357 to natives 188.

MR. MAC NEILL: In the higher branches.

MR. CURZON: Now, I think the House will be surprised to know that the figures are just the other way about. The Report of the Public Service Commission shows that in the higher ranks of the executive and judicial branches of the Uncovenanted Civil Service—excluding the special departments—there were 2,588 officers, of whom 2,449 were natives of India, and only 35 were Europeans not domiciled in India at the time of appointment. It is also fair to say, in speaking of these officers, that it would be a mistake to suppose that they are engaged only in the humbler and less important official duties. That is not so at all. The work entrusted to them is of great importance; it is with them that the great mass of the people are brought into contact, and a large proportion of the disputes connected with revenue, magisterial, and civil matters, arising out of the ordinary relations of man with man have to be decided by these officers. Nearly the whole of the civil judicial business throughout India, including a great part of that in the Appellate Courts, is transacted by natives. Native Judges have jurisdiction in all civil suits over Europeans and natives alike, without distinction of nationality. The duties of the Executive branch are hardly less responsible and important. I now proceed to deal with the Covenanted Civil Service—if the hon. Member will give me his attention—and here, again, I am compelled to correct the figures which, on the authority of an electioneering speech,

he has put before the House. The hon. Member said that in 1885 the proportion of Europeans to natives was 900 to 9. Let me give my figures. In January, 1888, the number of superior officers of the Indian Civil Administration was 964 Europeans to 59 Natives. Since 1874, notwithstanding the continually increasing demands for improved administration, the European members of that Service have been reduced by more than 22 per cent., and under the same system we may expect a reduction of another 12 per cent. Under the rules laid down by Lord Lytton's administration there is one statutory civilian for every five members of the Service. Now, I think the facts I have put before the House will show that when the hon. Gentleman says that natives are "boycotted" and "cheated" out of employment he is not justified in using language which he cannot support by facts. The facts are precisely opposite to his statement. The Government have consistently adhered to the proclamation of William IV., the terms of which the hon. Member read out; and if the hon. Member (whose interest in the subject no one can doubt) instead of making speeches here, were to go to India and acquaint himself with the actual situation, I doubt very much whether we should have any more of those accusations and allegations that we so often hear from him in this House. I might give other illustrations to show the policy of the Government of India in lending every encouragement to the natives of India to bear their share in the service of the country. Thirty years ago, when the Crown took over the Government, there was not a single native member of the Legislative Councils. There are now four in the Governor General's Council, five in Madras, five in Bombay, four in Bengal, and two in the North-West Provinces, 20 in all. In addition to these it will be my privilege before long to introduce a Bill dealing with the reorganisation and extension of the Councils by which the number of native members on them will be very considerably increased. Thirty years ago there was not a single Native Judge of the High Court. There are now three Native Judges in the High Court at

Calcutta, one each in Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces, or six in all. Colleges for the encouragement of engineering have been specially established in India, where every effort is made to attract natives into this important branch of the Public Service. I do not know that it is necessary to say much more in defence of our position. I might allude to the many natives of distinction who have filled high and honourable posts in Native States. I might allude to Municipalities and Local Boards where natives are playing a part, and are gaining experience in Local Government, which will fit them for higher positions. The hon. Gentleman complains of the absence of reference to these questions in the Queen's Speech, but I confess I think that had it been desirable to introduce further reference to Indian affairs, that reference instead of striking the note of promises as yet unredeemed, should rather have taken the line of congratulating Parliament upon the good results already accomplished. I hope these few considerations which I have laid before the House will have shown that the Government has a strong and convincing case, and may lead the hon. Gentleman to think there is no necessity for him to carry his Amendment to a Division.

\*(11.55.) SIR RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham): Though I sympathise with everything that can be done for the advancement of the natives of India, I must say there are portions of the speech of the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Mac Neill) which require a strong answer in the few moments that remain for this debate. The natives of India may be equal to us intellectually, and of course before the Law, and in the Courts they are our equals, and in Christian humility we are not to assume superiority morally over them. But there are certain qualities in which they are not our equals, namely, courage and warlike resource, administrative energy and capacity in the field or in the Cabinet. No legislation, no theories that hon. Gentlemen

opposite can advance, will make them equal to us in these respects. When you have to deal with a country like India you must have Englishmen in the front for the administration of affairs. They must have control of transport arrangements in time of war, and they must organise the operations for relief when danger of famine is apprehended. The organisation and administration of the great Departments must be in the hands of Englishmen—"The British"—well, British certainly, and the natives know that as well as we do. It is by the strong arm, the steady nerve, the cool head of British rulers, that our Indian Empire is sustained, and the vast British as well as native interests involved in that country are safeguarded.

(11.59.) MR. MAC NEILL: With the permission of the House I will withdraw my Amendment, only saying that at an early date I shall endeavour to revert to this subject again.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Debate further adjourned to Monday.

**PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING)  
(SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 92.)**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.59.) MR. C. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): In moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I need only say that it is the same Bill which has been before the House in a previous Session, and its object is to restore the Act passed some years ago to the state in which, as a Bill, it left this House, alterations being made in the House of Lords.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I can hardly agree

with the hon. Member in the description he has given of this Bill as one that has been, so far as I know, before the House on a previous occasion in its present shape. I rather think there is a clause in it which has not appeared before—

MR. CAMERON: No, not a word.

SIR C. J. PEARSON: However that may be, this is a matter of great importance to the community in Scotland, for it is a proposal to alter what is regarded as a settlement of the question embodied in the Act of 1887—

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Tuesday next.

**LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ALLOTMENTS  
BILL—(No. 94.)**

**SECOND READING**

Order for Second Reading read

(12.0.) DR. TANNER (Cork, Mid): This Bill, which I hope the House will now consent to read a second time, is in a small way, designed to afford some relief to the Irish labourer. It removes the restriction of half an acre upon allotments, extending it to an acre. Half an acre is not sufficient to assist a man who is out of continuous employment. Too frequently are Irish labourers reduced almost to a state of destitution, and only last year the late Chief Secretary had to introduce a measure to relieve the poorest classes from starvation. I hope this small measure will commend itself to the good feeling of the House, and will only add that I will give every opportunity for the discussion of Amendments in Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

(12.2.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I hope the House will agree to the Second Reading, and I only rise to draw the attention of the hon. Member to what I think is an error in drafting.

he has put before the House. The hon. Member said that in 1885 the proportion of Europeans to natives was 900 to 9. Let me give my figures. In January, 1888, the number of superior officers of the Indian Civil Administration was 964 Europeans to 59 Natives. Since 1874, notwithstanding the continually increasing demands for improved administration, the European members of that Service have been reduced by more than 22 per cent., and under the same system we may expect a reduction of another 12 per cent. Under the rules laid down by Lord Lytton's administration there is one statutory civilian for every five members of the Service. Now, I think the facts I have put before the House will show that when the hon. Gentleman says that natives are "boycotted" and "cheated" out of employment he is not justified in using language which he cannot support by facts. The facts are precisely opposite to his statement. The Government have consistently adhered to the proclamation of William IV., the terms of which the hon. Member read out; and if the hon. Member (whose interest in the subject no one can doubt) instead of making speeches here, were to go to India and acquaint himself with the actual situation, I doubt very much whether we should have any more of those accusations and allegations that we so often hear from him in this House. I might give other illustrations to show the policy of the Government of India in lending every encouragement to the natives of India to bear their share in the service of the country. Thirty years ago, when the Crown took over the Government, there was not a single native member of the Legislative Councils. There are now four in the Governor General's Council, five in Madras, five in Bombay, four in Bengal, and two in the North-West Provinces, 20 in all. In addition to these it will be my privilege before long to introduce a Bill dealing with the reorganisation and extension of the Councils by which the number of native members on them will be very considerably increased. Thirty years ago there was not a single Native Judge of the High Court. There are now three Native Judges in the High Court at

*Mr. Curzon*

Calcutta, one each in Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces, or six in all. Colleges for the encouragement of engineering have been specially established in India, where every effort is made to attract natives into this important branch of the Public Service. I do not know that it is necessary to say much more in defence of our position. I might allude to the many natives of distinction who have filled high and honourable posts in Native States. I might allude to Municipalities and Local Boards where natives are playing a part, and are gaining experience in Local Government, which will fit them for higher positions. The hon. Gentleman complains of the absence of reference to these questions in the Queen's Speech, but I confess I think that had it been desirable to introduce further reference to Indian affairs, that reference instead of striking the note of promises as yet unredeemed, should rather have taken the line of congratulating Parliament upon the good results already accomplished. I hope these few considerations which I have laid before the House will have shown that the Government has a strong and convincing case, and may lead the hon. Gentleman to think there is no necessity for him to carry his Amendment to a Division.

\*(11.55.) **SIR RICHARD TEMPLE** (Worcester, Evesham): Though I sympathise with everything that can be done for the advancement of the natives of India, I must say there are portions of the speech of the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Mac Neill) which require a strong answer in the few moments that remain for this debate. The natives of India may be equal to us intellectually, and of course before the Law, and in the Courts they are our equals, and in Christian humility we are not to assume superiority morally over them. But there are certain qualities in which they are not our equals, namely, courage and warlike resource, administrative energy and capacity in the field or in the Cabinet. No legislation, no theories that hon. Gentlemen

opposite can advance, will make them equal to us in these respects. When you have to deal with a country like India you must have Englishmen in the front for the administration of affairs. They must have control of transport arrangements in time of war, and they must organise the operations for relief when danger of famine is apprehended. The organisation and administration of the great Departments must be in the hands of Englishmen—"The British"—well, British certainly, and the natives know that as well as we do. It is by the strong arm, the steady nerve, the cool head of British rulers, that our Indian Empire is sustained, and the vast British as well as native interests involved in that country are safeguarded.

(11.59.) MR. MAC NEILL: With the permission of the House I will withdraw my Amendment, only saying that at an early date I shall endeavour to revert to this subject again.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Debate further adjourned to Monday.

**PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING)  
(SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 92.)**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.59.) MR. C. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): In moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I need only say that it is the same Bill which has been before the House in a previous Session, and its object is to restore the Act passed some years ago to the state in which, as a Bill, it left this House, alterations being made in the House of Lords.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. Pearson, Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I can hardly agree

with the hon. Member in the description he has given of this Bill as one that has been, so far as I know, before the House on a previous occasion in its present shape. I rather think there is a clause in it which has not appeared before —

MR. CAMERON: No, not a word.

SIR C. J. PEARSON: However that may be, this is a matter of great importance to the community in Scotland, for it is a proposal to alter what is regarded as a settlement of the question embodied in the Act of 1887—

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Tuesday next.

**LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ALLOTMENTS  
BILL—(No. 94.)**

**SECOND READING**

Order for Second Reading read

(12.0.) DR. TANNER (Cork, Mid): This Bill, which I hope the House will now consent to read a second time, is in a small way, designed to afford some relief to the Irish labourer. It removes the restriction of half an acre upon allotments, extending it to an acre. Half an acre is not sufficient to assist a man who is out of continuous employment. Too frequently are Irish labourers reduced almost to a state of destitution, and only last year the late Chief Secretary had to introduce a measure to relieve the poorest classes from starvation. I hope this small measure will commend itself to the good feeling of the House, and will only add that I will give every opportunity for the discussion of Amendments in Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

(12.2.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I hope the House will agree to the Second Reading, and I only rise to draw the attention of the hon. Member to what I think is an error in drafting.



presented to him, having been chosen by election, if the Governor General should find that such a system can properly be established. I am bound to say that I and some of our friends would have preferred that the possibility of election being one of the modes of presenting these persons to be nominated by the Council was more explicitly recognised in the Bill than it is; but, at the same time, I very well know the difficulties which there may be in carrying through a Bill of this kind. I regard it as essentially a tentative measure, and being so, I am quite willing to welcome it, although it opens the door, perhaps, in a very slight manner apparently on the face of it. What we really desire is that in this matter the Government of India should be able to exercise their own discretion on the spot as to the extent to which they may think it wise to advance in the direction that is desired. I do not think we are good judges here of the precise amount of concession that it would be advisable to make. I think if the Governor General of India should find that he is able to introduce, in some modified form, some system of election, it will be seen how it works; and, if it works well, the Governor General will be able, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to give a further extension to the principle. Feeling, as I do, that great caution is desirable in dealing with this subject in India, I should not be disposed to criticise in any hostile spirit the Bill as it stands. On the contrary, I believe it may lay the foundation of very useful changes in the constitution of the Councils in India with regard to this subject. With regard to the rest of the Bill, it contains a variety of useful propositions, but if any remark is to be made upon them, I think it will be more convenient to make it in Committee. Lastly, my Lords, I would say that I welcome the expression by the noble Viscount of the intention of the Government to press forward this Bill; and, although I have said already that I think it very important that it should be so pressed forward, I may be forgiven for again repeating on this occasion that I think it is almost dangerous to leave a subject of this kind hung up to be perpetually discussed by all manner of persons, and that having once all that, at all events, some amendment necessary with regard to the

*The Earl of Kimberley*

constituting these Legislative Councils is incumbent upon the Government and Parliament to pass the Bill that they may think expedient as speedily as possible into law.

**THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK:** My Lords, I have very few remarks to add to what has fallen from my noble Friend beside me (the Earl of Kimberley). I agree with the belief which he expressed that this clause will be elastic enough to enable some measures to be taken by the Viceroy of India in Council, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to popularise in some way or other the selections for the different Legislative Councils in India. I should have preferred that my noble Friend should have used the term "representation" rather than "election," although I do not believe there is any real difference between the two; for this reason: that I conceive, so far as I know, that India is a country quite unfit for any system of popular election by the formation of popular constituencies and the election of members by large constituencies; whereas I believe there are municipal and other bodies in India who can be perfectly well trusted to recommend to the Viceroy representatives of those bodies, and that very possibly (I am far from presuming to express an opinion with any degree of positiveness as to the present condition of India) some such system of representation as that might be found quite in accordance with the present condition of India, and would satisfy a feeling—I believe a legitimate feeling—which has been very moderately and properly expressed by public bodies in India of late on that matter. And I think that one of the great merits of the Bill, as was noticed by the noble Earl, is that it is very elastic. We in this country do not pretend to lay down any hard-and-fast rules under which these bodies are to be appointed; but it is left to those who know most about it, namely, the Governor General of India in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council: and we may hope, my Lords, that if this Bill (as I fervently desire myself it should) be passed during the present Session, this question may be, so far as

tion is concerned, set at rest for a considerable number of years.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I only rise for the purpose of expressing my general assent to the language which has just been used by the noble Lord, and at the same time entering a *caveat*. I quite agree with him that the word "representation" better expresses the intention that we have and that the Governor General has, than the more narrow word "election," which may not necessarily be applicable; but I should be sorry that it should be believed that we look at that representation as necessarily confined, or even specially assigned, to municipal bodies. I do not in the least desire to narrow the language or the elasticity of the Bill, or to say a word to discourage the use of such bodies; but I do demur to the idea that they are necessarily the main representatives of Indian opinion—I do not think that was the intention of the noble Lord.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: It was not at all.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I fear that those words might be interpreted in that way. I think that we all desire to popularise these bodies, so as practically to bring them into harmony with the dominant sentiment of the Indian people; but we must be careful lest, by the application of occidental machinery, we bring into power not the strong, natural, vigorous, effective elements of Indian Society, but the more artificial and weakly elements which we ourselves have made and have brought into prominence. It would be a great evil if, in any system of Government which we gradually develop, the really strong portions of Indian society did not obtain that share in the government to which their natural position among their own people traditionally entitles them.

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

#### TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION AND THE COUNTY COUNCILS.

##### QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

EARL COWPER: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the subject of which I have given notice. I do not think it will

be necessary for me to waste your Lordships' time by enlarging upon the advantages of technical education or the want of it in this country. There is no doubt that many other countries, particularly Germany, are far in advance of us in this work, and that a great deal remains to be done in the matter in this country. I need not insist upon this if Her Majesty's Government are, as your Lordships are aware, perfectly in accordance with me in this feeling, for they have already given a grant to be applied, if the County Council see fit, for the purpose of promoting technical instruction, and, what is equally important, the House of Commons seems to be of the same opinion, because it was in deference to the feeling of that Assembly that this grant was made. I need not enter into the history of the way in which this grant was made. Your Lordships are aware that two years ago a certain sum of money, which had been set aside in the Customs and Excise duties for the purpose of buying up public houses, was, in deference to the expression of a strong wish in another place, when it was found that that was not a popular way of spending the money, given to the different County Councils to be applied as they thought fit, and it was strongly recommended that it should be applied towards the promotion of technical instruction. Of course, if they preferred it, the County Councils might apply it merely to the amelioration of their local rates. My Lords, the great majority of the County Councils throughout the country did elect to apply it, according to the recommendation of the Government, towards the encouragement of technical instruction, although they were under certain difficulties from not knowing whether it was to be treated as a windfall or as the first instalment of a regular allowance; because some hopes had been held out to them that if they did spend it in the way suggested, it would be given them again. In spite of this uncertainty, they set to work, and they have been, on the whole, I think, taking in most places very good measures to carry out the object for which it was given. This year again a somewhat smaller grant, but still a considerable grant, has been given in the same way, which has in many places induced the County Council to take it for granted that the allowance will be a per-

presented to him, having been chosen by election, if the Governor General should find that such a system can properly be established. I am bound to say that I and some of our friends would have preferred that the possibility of election being one of the modes of presenting these persons to be nominated by the Council was more explicitly recognised in the Bill than it is; but, at the same time, I very well know the difficulties which there may be in carrying through a Bill of this kind. I regard it as essentially a tentative measure, and being so, I am quite willing to welcome it, although it opens the door, perhaps, in a very slight manner apparently on the face of it. What we really desire is that in this matter the Government of India should be able to exercise their own discretion on the spot as to the extent to which they may think it wise to advance in the direction that is desired. I do not think we are good judges here of the precise amount of concession that it would be advisable to make. I think if the Governor General of India should find that he is able to introduce, in some modified form, some system of election, it will be seen how it works; and, if it works well, the Governor General will be able, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to give a further extension to the principle. Feeling, as I do, that great caution is desirable in dealing with this subject in India, I should not be disposed to criticise in any hostile spirit the Bill as it stands. On the contrary, I believe it may lay the foundation of very useful changes in the constitution of the Councils in India with regard to this subject. With regard to the rest of the Bill, it contains a variety of useful propositions, but if any remark is to be made upon them, I think it will be more convenient to make it in Committee. Lastly, my Lords, I would say that I welcome the expression by the noble Viscount of the intention of the Government to press forward this Bill; and, although I have said already that I think it very important that it should be so pressed forward, I may be forgiven for again repeating on this occasion that I think it is almost dangerous to leave a subject of this kind hung up to be perpetually discussed by all manner of persons, and that having once allowed that, at all events, some amendment is necessary with regard to the mode of

*The Earl of Kimberley*

constituting these Legislative Councils, it is incumbent upon the Government and Parliament to pass the Bill that they may think expedient as speedily as possible into law.

\*THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: My Lords, I have very few remarks to add to what has fallen from my noble Friend beside me (the Earl of Kimberley). I agree with the belief which he expressed that this clause will be elastic enough to enable some measures to be taken by the Viceroy of India in Council, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to popularise in some way or other the selections for the different Legislative Councils in India. I should have preferred that my noble Friend should have used the term "representation" rather than "election," although I do not believe there is any real difference between the two; for this reason: that I conceive, so far as I know, that India is a country quite unfit for any system of popular election by the formation of popular constituencies and the election of members by large constituencies; whereas I believe there are municipal and other bodies in India who can be perfectly well trusted to recommend to the Viceroy representatives of those bodies, and that very possibly (I am far from presuming to express an opinion with any degree of positiveness as to the present condition of India) some such system of representation as that might be found quite in accordance with the present condition of India, and would satisfy a feeling—I believe a legitimate feeling—which has been very moderately and properly expressed by public bodies in India of late on that matter. And I think that one of the great merits of the Bill, as was noticed by the noble Earl, is that it is very elastic. We in this country do not pretend to lay down any hard-and-fast rules under which these bodies are to be appointed; but it is left to those who know most about it, namely, the Governor General of India in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council: and we may hope, my Lords, that if this Bill (as I fervently desire myself it should) be passed during the present Session, this question may be, so far as legislation is concerned, set at rest for a very considerable number of years.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY):** My Lords, I only rise for the purpose of expressing my general assent to the language which has just been used by the noble Lord, and at the same time entering a *caveat*. I quite agree with him that the word "representation" better expresses the intention that we have and that the Governor General has, than the more narrow word "election," which may not necessarily be applicable; but I should be sorry that it should be believed that we look at that representation as necessarily confined, or even specially assigned, to municipal bodies. I do not in the least desire to narrow the language or the elasticity of the Bill, or to say a word to discourage the use of such bodies; but I do demur to the idea that they are necessarily the main representatives of Indian opinion—I do not think that was the intention of the noble Lord.

**THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK:** It was not at all.

**THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY:** I fear that those words might be interpreted in that way. I think that we all desire to popularise these bodies, so as practically to bring them into harmony with the dominant sentiment of the Indian people; but we must be careful lest, by the application of occidental machinery, we bring into power not the strong, natural, vigorous, effective elements of Indian Society, but the more artificial and weakly elements which we ourselves have made and have brought into prominence. It would be a great evil if, in any system of Government which we gradually develop, the really strong portions of Indian society did not obtain that share in the government to which their natural position among their own people traditionally entitles them.

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

#### TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION AND THE COUNTY COUNCILS.

##### QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

**EARL COWPER:** My Lords, I rise to call attention to the subject of which I have given notice. I do not think it will

be necessary for me to waste your Lordships' time by enlarging upon the advantages of technical education or the want of it in this country. There is no doubt that many other countries, particularly Germany, are far in advance of us in this work, and that a great deal remains to be done in the matter in this country. I need not insist upon this if Her Majesty's Government are, as your Lordships are aware, perfectly in accordance with me in this feeling, for they have already given a grant to be applied, if the County Council see fit, for the purpose of promoting technical instruction, and, what is equally important, the House of Commons seems to be of the same opinion, because it was in deference to the feeling of that Assembly that this grant was made. I need not enter into the history of the way in which this grant was made. Your Lordships are aware that two years ago a certain sum of money, which had been set aside in the Customs and Excise duties for the purpose of buying up public houses, was, in deference to the expression of a strong wish in another place, when it was found that that was not a popular way of spending the money, given to the different County Councils to be applied as they thought fit, and it was strongly recommended that it should be applied towards the promotion of technical instruction. Of course, if they preferred it, the County Councils might apply it merely to the amelioration of their local rates. My Lords, the great majority of the County Councils throughout the country did elect to apply it, according to the recommendation of the Government, towards the encouragement of technical instruction, although they were under certain difficulties from not knowing whether it was to be treated as a windfall or as the first instalment of a regular allowance; because some hopes had been held out to them that if they did spend it in the way suggested, it would be given them again. In spite of this uncertainty, they set to work, and they have been, on the whole, I think, taking in most places very good measures to carry out the object for which it was given. This year again a somewhat smaller grant, but still a considerable grant, has been given in the same way, which has in many places induced the County Council to take it for granted that the allowance will be a per-

manent one, and they have in many places set to work to establish classes of different kinds, in the urban as well as the rural districts, for the sake of teaching every kind of different subject which can at all come within the scope of the Act; and particularly in the rural districts they are doing very good work, besides, in affording interesting occupation to the young men in our country villages, which is a subject rather before the country now, so as to add a little interest to their life as well as to give them instruction. But, supposing that this grant is not going to be renewed, it would be a good thing that it should be known at once, otherwise mischief may be done; because, if these classes are not to be continued, not only would disappointment be caused, but money would have been wasted in setting them going. And, besides this, there is a class of people who are qualifying themselves, in consequence of what they suppose is a growing demand, to be instructors in these different subjects, and are giving up their time and spending their money in so doing. It stands to reason that if, after all, there is no opening for them, they will be rather badly treated, for they have been encouraged to devote their money and time in this direction. My Lords, in most cases the County Councils are taking these steps on the assumption that this grant will be permanent; under some circumstances they are still hesitating, in consequence of not knowing the intention of the Government in the matter, and are exposed to the charge of vacillation and doing nothing, from which I think it is fair that they should be relieved without any longer delay. In some places they have elected to treat the grant entirely as a windfall, and, as they have no reason to suppose that they will get more than last year and this year, the only thing to do, they say, is to divide the money as well as they can among existing institutions. In this way a great deal of money is being frittered away. For all these different reasons I think it is desirable that we should know whether we are to have a permanent grant or not. My Lords, I do not object myself to the Government having proceeded in a tentative manner, and I certainly am not one of those who complain of this thing being worked through the County

*Earl Cowper*

Councils. Now that we have established these bodies, and very good men throughout the country have been found to come forward and devote themselves to the work, it is time to think of giving them something more to do than merely to look after the roads, and trying to stop the cattle disease when it breaks out, and the joint management of the police, and so on. I think everything that gives them something to do is a good thing. I think also that the needs of different parts of the country are different one from another, and that by trusting the local authorities we are more likely to distribute this money in a way to suit the needs of each particular district, than if we were to organise a scheme at head-quarters and carry it out by the management of some central authority. And, whether the Government have done what we wish or not, we must also feel that they are the first Government who have taken the matter up at all and done anything for technical instruction. I think, my Lords, I may, with all due deference, ask the Government to remove our uncertainty, and I hope I may ask them also to make this grant permanent. It is not for me, of course, to say in what manner a permanent allowance is to be made, nor do I think that is a question for this House to enter into; it is more a question for the other House to decide how the grant is to be made, and what its amount is to be. We have only to deal here with general principles. Before I sit down I will only allude to one other difficulty that the County Councils labour under in carrying out this matter. We are, of course, obliged to consult the South Kensington authorities—the Science and Art Department—with regard to what subjects may be taught. I am bound to say that this body has shown not only the utmost courtesy to everyone who has applied, and taken the utmost pains to tell them what they may do, but has also exercised, I think, a wide discretion in giving as free an interpretation as possible to the Act to enable it to work. There is one clause that stands very much in their way, and in the way of the County Councils too: that is the clause which forbids the teaching of any trade, occupation, or industry. My Lords, this hampers the Department very much. It is not too much to say that it is really

only by going as near the wind as possible in evading the clause that the Act can be made to work at all. I do not know the history of it—whether it was put in for the sake of safeguarding any particular industry, or whether there was some particular interest which it was necessary to conciliate to get the Bill through the House. All I know is that the clause is a very difficult one, and causes a great deal of inconvenience. My Lords, technical instruction has been defined as instruction in those branches of art or science which may be definitely applied to some specific industry. Surely the best way to teach these branches is by applying them, that is to say by uniting practice with theory; otherwise, if this clause were acted upon strictly, we should be reduced to doing very little more than giving a series of lectures unaccompanied either by illustrations or experiments. I remember many years ago, when I was at Oxford, having to attend a certain number of lectures, and probably many of your Lordships, at the same period of your lives, had to do the same. I can only say that of the many benefits upon which I can look back from that great and venerable institution, I do not think anything I got from attending lectures can be numbered among them. I suppose one idea of this clause is that it should not interfere with private effort. That may be a good thing in itself—that might be a reason for leaving technical instruction to private effort altogether, as I believe some people wish to do; or it might be a reason for putting in safeguards. But really to divide the two by having all the practice taught by one set of people, and all the theory by another—the theory by the Government and the practice by private enterprise—is not a dividing of the thing which commends itself to my mind. I do not know whether this clause can be modified; I only mention it in passing to call attention to the subject. My real object in trespassing on your Lordships' time is to remove the uncertainty that at present prevails, and that the County Councils may know what they are about, by being informed whether, or not, they may really look forward to having a permanent annual Government grant.

\*THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: My Lords, I should like to endorse what has fallen from the noble Earl as to the value that is put upon technical instruction in the

counties. Having acted as Chairman of my County Council Committee upon this subject, I can say that it has excited a very great deal of interest, and that there appears to be every prospect of great usefulness to come from this grant in favour of technical instruction. I did not follow the noble Earl, if I understood him rightly, when he said that there was a recommendation, along with this grant, in favour of giving it to technical education. My recollection is that there was no recommendation from the Government upon this matter. But, my Lords, that makes the argument in favour of continuing the grant all the stronger; because, of their own initiative, the County Councils, or a large majority of them, have decided to devote this grant to technical instruction. I believe London is the chief exception. There can be no question, my Lords, of the great interest that has been excited in the whole country in this direction. The county with which I am associated, Huntingdonshire, is a strictly rural county, and we found the greatest difficulty in starting any subject which could be of use in a strictly agricultural rural district. But I may mention one. We have found that carpentering classes, which we had to apply to the Science and Art Department for permission to hold, have been most useful, and that during this winter in some villages very large numbers indeed of common labourers have attended these classes, and the work they have turned out is most creditable. My Lords, I would also allude to another point in supplementing what the noble Earl has said, namely, that a great many instructors were preparing themselves for teaching technical instruction throughout the country in the future. Not only is that so, but many colleges have been started for the purpose of agricultural education, and they are relying upon this grant, supplemented and assisted by donations from the County Councils towards them, for their maintenance. I do not know much about the Northern Colleges, but in connection with Cambridge there is a movement before the authorities to start a special agricultural college which is to be maintained entirely by a grant from the County Councils in the Eastern Counties of England. If this is not to be a permanent grant these institutions will suffer considerably—they will die a

natural death after having just been started, and the loss to the country will be considerable. I am one of those who believe that a great deal of good is to be done in this branch of education. There is no doubt that when a scholar leaves the primary school there is a lapse in the way of anything providing any instruction which is useful to him; but the proof is certainly forthcoming that in these rural villages, if you can encourage the agricultural labourer to attend classes to teach him anything of a technical kind, he is willing to attend to receive that instruction; and I consider that in that way we shall do as much good as in any other in keeping the agricultural labourer on the soil. I only hope, with the noble Earl, that the Government will make a statement that the County Councils may know that this grant will be continued permanently.

\***LORD NORTON:** Before the Lord President replies I should be glad to say one word in support of what has fallen from the noble Earl opposite on this question. I think everybody who knows anything of the subject must feel it is high time that we should have information both as to how this Technical Instruction grant has been spent, and how it is intended to be dealt with in future. For my own part, I think a more vague and unconstitutional vote of public money was never made since Parliament first began. It was appropriated by the House of Commons for a totally different object, and diverted to this object, and, having been so diverted, it is sent broadcast over the country to large and small County Councils, without any very definite specification of the mode in which it was to be spent, except that it was to be upon technical instruction. So far was it from binding the action of the County Councils, that the Council which has the largest share (one quarter of the whole grant) has spent it upon something totally different; the grant being half a million, the London County Council, having £140,000 out of it, have spent it not on technical instruction, but simply in relief of the local rates of London. But, my Lords, bad as it is that money should be so diverted from its first appropriation and afterwards so irregularly spent, I think there is a still greater mischief lurking in this Treasury grant: that it is increasing

*The Marquess of Huntly*

the tendency of the present time is to look to the Treasury for doing a thing. In fact, it is the most symptomatic of the spirit of this country going down, that we are more and more encouraged by Parliament to subsidise the public purse, and to look to the Treasury to do things which ought to be done by the voluntary spirit of the country, as they used to be, and which will be much better done. With regard to technical instruction, the youth of the country used to be apprenticed to various trades by private endowments, or by employers, whose object it was to benefit them. There are a great number of employers who have made noble provisions of this sort. But then came the Technical Instruction Act, which directed all this action on the part of the employers to the State. No man will do that which finds the country is willing to vote out of the public purse to do. The noble Earl from whom I have learned most of the facts of this subject is Mr. Mather, the Member for North Lancashire. That man, who has engineering works at Salford and employs many men in his employment, established his works two technical schools at which all his younger workmen were to be trained; they were shown every new invention, and it was the business of the foreman at the works, whenever anything new was done, to teach and show it to the apprentices. When this Technical Instruction Act was passed, that noble Earl checked others, it did not check Mr. Mather; on the contrary, so interested he was upon the advancement of art in Lancashire, that he continued his noble work, which cost him thousands a year, but he supported the Technical Instruction Act, and amended it greatly in the Commons. We know, if it had not been for him, it would have been a much worse Act than it is. But it was amended by him last week of the Session of 1889, when he came into this House and was through all its stages on the day of the Bill's introduction. Mr. Mather still continues his work. I asked him how it was, and he said, "face of the very thing that he could not do, namely, work of that sort which is thrown upon public money; he said—" Because I saw that the Technical Instruction Act must be worked in the mode of a rate in aid of voluntary work, and not in superseding voluntary work in the various localities of the country."

And so it has been by the intelligent manufacturers of the North. But then I said—"Though that Act will enable a small rate in aid from local rates to subsidize voluntary action, yet you could not say this of the Treasury grant sent broadcast over the whole country; that at all events would supersede voluntary action." He said, "No, we have managed carefully to prevent that in Lancashire and Yorkshire; the manufacturers have combined together, and have organised a system of distributing the grant only in the way of aid to voluntary undertakings. In that way they have deprived this Treasury grant of the chief mischief to which it was likely to lead." What does this show? It shows me that a subsidy of this sort applies very differently to different parts of the country, just as the political franchise in an intelligent part of the country, like Lancashire and Yorkshire, is very differently used from what is the case in a simply rural district like Warwickshire or Wiltshire. In my own county, Warwickshire, I know when the sum of £9,000, the share of this Vote, came, they did not know what in the world to do with it; but they said "as it is a gift" (for they had already got in the country to look upon a Treasury grant as a gift from Heaven, and to forget entirely that it comes out of their own pockets, so far have they been demoralized by hanging upon the patronage of the Government)—"as it is a gift we had better take it and do something with it." In Lancashire and Yorkshire this Act has not done harm, because it has been so carefully treated as a subsidy to local undertakings; but I maintain that in a large part of the Kingdom the fatal tendency of such a largess as this must have a bad effect, from its not having been neutralized by specific appropriation and private organization, as has been done in Manchester. My Lords, I only say that I hope the Lord President will reply to the noble Earl opposite that the information shall be given us what the intentions of the Government are as to this Treasury grant in future; and I would add this—which I would move myself if necessary, but I cannot help hoping that the Lord President will say that he is perfectly willing to give it without a Motion—a Return of Parliament of the way in which the Treasury grant

has been expended up to this time by every County Council throughout the Kingdom.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK): My Lords, it is not at all unnatural that the noble Earl opposite and others interested in the work of County Councils should wish to know upon what footing they stand with respect to this Treasury grant. And, in the first place, I would just say, with regard to what my noble Friend behind me has said, that I do not quite understand his argument, which is—that where this grant is properly used it does good, or, at all events, does no harm; but that in other places, where it is improperly used, it apparently, in his opinion, is doing a great deal of harm. But he has not pointed out the places in which it is properly used, nor, in fact, has he come to any conclusion apparently upon this subject, like the County Councils themselves; for the County Councils have, very naturally, been using the money in rather a tentative manner, endeavouring to ascertain what was most suitable to the populations around them, and the best mode of meeting the wants of those particular districts. For that reason in many parts of the country the money has been distributed to the Urban Sanitary Authority or other authorities who know the wants of their particular localities, but, of course, keeping an account of the expenditure of that money and the mode in which it is dealt with. My noble Friend behind me wants a Return of all that has been done by the County Councils. That would be most voluminous. But I can tell him where he may find it in abstract most efficiently set forth, and that is in these two small books, published by a Society of which the Duke of Devonshire is the head, *A Record of Technical and Secondary Education*. They published the first number in November last, and the second in January last. So far as they go they seem to me to contain a most complete account of what is being done by the Councils. But with regard to the general statement of what has been done I find that, out of 62 County Councils in England and Wales, 52 are applying the whole sum received, under the Local Taxation Act, to technical instruction, while nine are giving a part to it; so that that accounts



really for all but one, and that one is the one which, as my noble Friend says, has received the largest sum—the County Council of London. Now, my Lords, there are some who would say that if you are to apply this sum specially to technical instruction (which is not quite the case at present, it is only giving the power to use it for technical instruction, and giving certainly a hint in the Act of Parliament that it should be so used), you must make it compulsory upon all County Councils to apply it in that way. But the time does not seem to me to have arrived for taking that step, because there has been shown such vigour and vitality on the part of County Councils that there is no need to put pressure upon them. With regard to the County Boroughs, I think it is very much the same. Out of the 63 County Boroughs, in every case, except Wolverhampton, the whole or nearly the whole amount has been so devoted. And, besides that, there is a very remarkable fact, which shows the zeal and energy that is going on in these different districts. For I find in a Return made by the same Society, which has taken trouble over the subject, that there are a great number of places (I need not enumerate them all, but I have a long list of them) which applied, not only the money they had so received, but rates that they have raised under the Technical Instruction Act, in order to further expedite the business they have in hand. My Lords, I am not going, at this stage of the business, to come to a definite conclusion as to how a system of technical instruction in these different districts would work; but this I would say: my noble Friend seems to be under the impression that a check has been put upon voluntary effort, in connection with this subject, by the grant which has been made by the Treasury. I believe it to be precisely the reverse. I believe it to be perfectly clear that there has been an enormous increase, both in the number of persons who apply themselves to this technical instruction, and in those who manage it. Look at what the effect has been in the Science and Art Schools, where we find we are put in the greatest possible difficulty by the enormous number of papers sent in for examination; 190,000 papers were sent in last year for examination in the Science

*Viscount Cranbrook*

and Art Department. It has become a business that it is almost impossible to manage. And, in consequence of that, the Science and Art Department, guarded as they are now by the County Councils having these funds at their disposal, have altered, by a Minute from May next, the lower class education, on which considerable grants have been earned, and diverting them to a higher kind of education, so that the County Councils may not be working with them and paying double for the same thing; but that it may be divided: the Science and Art Department giving its attention, in the Science Department specially, to education which will bring people more forward and make them more fit for the occupations in which they are to be engaged. And upon this subject I would say one more word with respect to a point made by the noble Earl opposite who introduced this question, that the Act of Parliament prevented the teaching of trades. It was never meant that you should teach trades, and you could not do so effectually without interfering with the workshops. What the Act really means is this: That there is many a young man who may be in the workshop learning dexterity in the use of the materials so placed in his hand, but it is not the less important for him that he should attend the evening classes, as is done in certain parts of the kingdom, and learn the scientific use of those materials which are so put in his hands, and, not only to use them under the lecturer, but also by experiments to learn, in fact, that manual dexterity which begins as you see in the schools. We have enforced drawing in schools. But what is the reason for it? It is that the children learn manual dexterity. We are not going to make drawing masters, but to make persons begin their scientific education by means of using their scientific instruction dexterously with their hands as well as in their minds; very much as in Birmingham they have set up a sort of jewellery establishment, where they teach the scientific mode of dealing with jewels, but the people who come there are being employed in the workshops and learning manually. Many of your Lordships, I dare say, may have read an article by Lord Armstrong in, I think, the *Nineteenth Century*, which took the view very distinctly of rather de-

reciating technical instruction and the mere scientific system, because, he said, the only way in which the workman can really learn his work is in the workshop. So it is all through, as I think my noble Friend opposite will find. For instance, in dairying it is very difficult to say, when you are teaching the manipulation of butter by a scientific lecture, that you are not teaching a trade. Still, it is only after a long experience in the actual work of a dairy that an effective dairymaid is made; and yet the instruction she receives is a very good thing to begin with, that she may know the scientific principles upon which she has to work. So I hope in some of the schools where carpentering is taught in the general sense—that is to say, you make the boys draw the different things they are going to make, and they make them in wood, not for use, as they will afterwards have to make them in metal or otherwise probably, but to show that they have arrived at a scientific knowledge of the particular pursuit in which they are going to be engaged. They will be better workmen for working not only by rule of thumb, but by such scientific instructions as they will have received. I have looked through the different methods in which the County Councils have employed this money, and I am bound to say it strikes me that though in a great many instances, as they say themselves, it has been only a tentative process, they have gone very carefully to work, in order to ascertain how they may best discipline the young people of their counties. For instance, if you go to Bedfordshire you will find that a certain amount of the Vote has been devoted to technical instruction generally, but that also in certain districts it has been used for instruction in the straw work, which your Lordships know is one of the industries of that county, in which they learn the mode of manipulation; but it will take a long time before they will be actually workmen capable of bringing out the high class of produce for which that county is celebrated. I mention that as one instance. In other cases the County Councils have taken a different view; they have established colleges or scientific schools of different kinds, whether it be in horticulture, in bee-keeping, or other things, and they give scholarships from the

elementary schools to these colleges. And, my Lords, when I look at what has been done by the County Councils, and the way in which they have engaged the funds which have been placed in their hands, I cannot help recalling what was said by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he was asked by Lord Hartington in the House of Commons—I think more than a year ago—what was to be done with this money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

“I do not consider I am in a position to give any further or official assurance, but I may say that there are no suggestions before me for applying these grants to some other people, and I may add, as my personal opinion, that if the County Councils set themselves heartily to work, as in many instances they appear to be doing, to utilise the grant for important educational purposes, it would probably be difficult for any Minister to persuade Parliament to divert them, even if he desired himself to do so.”

My Lords, now the County Councils have stepped so far in that it would be impossible; and I do not hesitate to say that, inasmuch as the grants are made under an Act of Parliament, it seems to me that you have a guarantee, so far as this Government is concerned, that it has not the smallest intention of repealing that Act of Parliament, or taking the money for any other purpose; and I am quite convinced, from the mode in which that money has been laid hold of and used, and the mode in which the County Councils are taking steps to use it with even greater advantage, that no Government will repeal that Act of Parliament with a view of taking it from them. Whether the time may come when they should think it necessary to insist upon its being used in that particular form is not before us at present, and I will not dwell upon it. I may, however, say this: I do hope that the County Council of London will not be altogether backward in applying some of this money for the purposes for which, no doubt, although Parliament did not assign it for that particular object, it practically gave a strong recommendation that it should be employed. Here in London, where there are schools of every description where scholarships might be given, or instruction might be had for payment, and where in every way these schools which exist, voluntary and other, can be made more

of State in requiring the Governor General or the Governors of Madras and Bombay, or the Commander-in-Chief, to come home? Are those "public grounds" matters of grave consequence affecting India? If they are, surely the place for the Governor General and these high officers is in India; if they are matters connected with this country, surely we ought to have some explanation as to what kind of matters are of sufficient importance to justify the Secretary of State in requiring the Governor General or the Commander-in-Chief to come home. We all felt, my Lords, that Her Majesty's Jubilee was an occasion when it was quite justifiable, as a perfectly exceptional circumstance, to bring home to this country the Commander-in-Chief in Bombay, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. I do not think anybody could fairly quarrel with an exceptional Act of Parliament being passed in those circumstances. But, my Lords, in ordinary circumstances I cannot myself conceive that it would be right to summon the Commander-in-Chief in India home to this country. He is in a military position, perhaps the most responsible in the world, with dangers constantly occurring that cannot be expected. I must say, my Lords, that the whole policy expressed in this Bill—I will not go into details—appears to me to be open to very considerable doubt, and I trust, if your Lordships pass the Second Reading of this Bill, to which I should not myself be a consenting party, the Secretary of State will lay before the House some Papers showing that the matter has been considered, and, moreover, that he will consider whether there should not be some definition, even if this Bill goes forward, as to what the public grounds are to be on which, and some limit of time for which the Governor General may be required to come home by the Secretary of State. There is no limit whatever in the Bill. Absolutely the Governor General or the Commander-in-Chief may be sent for to come home by the Secretary of State, and may remain without any limit of time in this country. These are, I think, sufficient reasons to show your Lordships that this Bill requires further consideration. I will not dwell upon another matter; still, it is a matter of some importance. These officers are to come

*The Earl of Northbrook*

home from India on public grounds connected with this country. Who is to pay the expense? I presume the Secretary of State will move in the other House that all expenses connected with the visit shall be paid out of the Imperial Revenues, because it would be very unfair upon the Indian Revenues that the expense should come out of the finances of India. Not that it would be any very great sum, but as a matter of principle. These matters are being watched by the people of India, and care should be taken to do justice to all parties, and if the visits home are to be on English grounds, care should be taken in another place to put the whole of the expense upon the finances of this country, and not upon the finances of India. I myself, my Lords, am against increasing the facilities for people holding these high offices to vacate their appointments for a limited time. I think there is something to be said, if there is now any difficulty (I do not believe myself there is), in favour of enabling the Lieutenant Governors of Bengal, the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, to come home on sick leave. I apprehend that they can do so now under the present law. I believe that, on a medical certificate, those officers may come home on sick leave for a certain time, and I say that I think there is no objection to that; in point of fact, I think there is good reason for allowing it, because these officers are all officers belonging to the Indian Civil Service, and, therefore, it would be hard upon them, if their health broke down in those appointments, that they should not be allowed to come home on sick leave in the same way as they can if they fill the high appointments of Members of the Governor General's Council. But that argument does not apply, in my opinion, to the other officers mentioned here; it does not apply to the Governor General of India, to the Governors of Madras and Bombay, or to the Commander-in-Chief in India—it would not in any way interfere with his military position that he should have to give up his appointment—it does not apply to the Commanders-in-Chief of Madras and Bombay. My Lords, the reason why I object to any greater facilities being given for the vacation of these important offices is that, at present in India, the constant vacancies in offices, by reason of their

olders going away on sick leave and otherwise, is a great public evil. It is to use a familiar expression) a general use of "post;" one man goes away and another is acting for him, and a third acts for the person transferred; so that all over India there is uncertainty as to who is really doing these important duties. And, I think, if you extend this system to officers filling these high appointments (and it would be extended if this Bill passes), you would be increasing an evil which is, even now, by no means of minor importance.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY):**

My Lords, I shall not at all contest the criticisms which the noble Lord has based upon the wording of this Bill. My noble Friend thought it right to adopt the wording taken in the Standing Committee, but I readily grant to the noble Lord that it will require a good deal of correction, and there are particular questions which I will readily give as questions of detail to be debated at another stage of the Bill, if your Lordships think fit to give the Bill a Second Reading. But on the general principle cannot concur with the noble Lord. The state of the case is this: that when these Acts were passed originally, which are modifying now, it was impossible to get from India to England except by going round the Cape, and it took six or eight months to do so. At that time short leave was unknown. Gradually, as the means of communication increased, some parts of the Service of India which were not limited by Statute received the advantage (of which, perhaps, as the noble Lord says, they have too abundantly availed themselves) of privileged leave, and other forms of leave, which enabled them to come home from time to time. But the result of this is that statutory law is not in any way to diminish the game of "post," of which the noble Lord complains; it is to create this anomaly: that some of the posts at the head of the Service, which are held by the oldest men—by the men who have been most tried, by the men to whom leave on medical certificates may be most absolutely refused—y—to them it is impossible, while it is freely granted to all the rest of the Service. I do not think the noble Lord is entitled to put the onus upon us. He has to show why

we have to keep this strange anomaly standing quite by itself in the Service of the Queen, and which has grown up to its present proportions through the enormous alteration of the conditions of passage which have taken place. The noble Lord asks what evils there are. I decline to be committed to instances; it is impossible to give instances; instances would involve not only entering upon private affairs of individuals, but speaking of matters which properly ought not to be spoken of in public. But there are two inconveniences of the present system which are more or less grave. One of them is the impossibility of consultation; the other is that, owing to the difficulty of obtaining temporary leave, or medical leave, it is difficult to fill some of the offices mentioned in this Schedule. I do not mean to go into details; but nobody who has had anything to do with the filling of them will doubt the accuracy of what I say. I am quite ready to go into the question of limitations, if it is thought that limitations are necessary. If you cannot trust the Secretary of State in Council, I should not resist putting in any limitations which may be thought wise; but I think the time has come for departing from an arrangement which is evidently obsolete, and which is a hindrance, in more than one respect, to the proper carrying on of the Public Service. I speak feelingly from my own office when I say that consultation is of the essence of the Public Service, and one of the great advantages which the facilities of communication give to us now; and in the Foreign Office I know it is frequently used; I believe it is frequently used in the Colonial Office also, though I have no personal experience of that; but we are debarred from personal communication with the members of the Councils of the three Provinces by the state of the law. I do not wish to revert to old troubles; but my impression is that some points on which I had the misfortune to differ from the noble Lord very strongly, when we were in the respective offices of Secretary of State and Governor General, might have been entirely averted if it had been possible for me to send home for the persons principally concerned. I therefore think you are placing an unnecessary fetter and impediment on the usefulness of the Public Service. If you cannot trust those who have the adminis-

tration of these duties to exercise powers so large as are contained in this Bill, well, offer to us limitations of them. I will not exclude the idea of them; but I do hope the House will consent to depart from a system which in itself is anomalous and unwise.

\*THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, with respect to a portion of the Bill, I am not disposed to disagree with the noble Marquess opposite. For instance, with regard to the Governors General of Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab, I do not think there is any necessity for a restriction bearing upon them more than upon any other member of the Indian Service. It may be necessary to give them the power to come home either for consultation or for leave. But I confess I do feel, with my noble Friend Lord Northbrook, grave doubt as to the applicability of this Bill, either to the Governor General of India or to the Commander-in-Chief. There is no doubt much force in what the noble Marquess has said as to the advantage of consultation with officers with whom you have to act; but here we have to consider, as in most other matters, the balance of advantages, and we have to consider whether the possibility of the Governor General being brought home to Europe, for the purpose of consultation with the Government here, might not bring about evils greater than any advantage that could be derived. Your Lordships must bear in mind that there is no officer serving under the Government, certainly not an Ambassador or Colonial Governor, whose responsibility can in any degree be compared with that of the Viceroy of India. The Viceroy stands, as it were, on a pinnacle, and his personal responsibility is very great. In this country, whatever Government may be in Office aims, I think, to send out the most distinguished and able man who can be selected for the post, and that because we consider that it is not merely an administrative post that can be carried on by any man with the assistance of others, even if he is not of very high character and ability, but that upon the personal character, and influence, and ability of the Viceroy depends, to a very great extent, the conduct of that vast machine—the Government of the Empire of India. I think that the temptation to send for the Viceroy in

*The Marquess of Salisbury*

cases where serious difference arise between the Viceroy (himself probably a distinguished man) and the Government at home, would be very great. On both sides there would be a strong desire, probably by consultation, to avoid differences which on either side would be deplored, and it would be very difficult to resist an application on either side for the use of the power under this Bill. But it might be that serious danger might result, because in the Empire of India there might suddenly be some movement, internal or external, when the absence of the Viceroy and the occupation of his post by some temporary occupant might deprive the Government in India of that prompt action which, at such a time, is most essential. Therefore, while I do not deny the force of the argument put by the noble Marquess, I feel that on the other hand the disadvantages are very serious. And I think the same thing applies to the Commander-in-Chief. The Commander-in-Chief is a soldier of the highest eminence, and is a man upon whom the greatest responsibility rests; and if there were to be any serious frontier war—still more, any serious outbreak in India in the absence of the Commander-in-Chief—some great calamity might result. I say nothing as to the Governors of the Punjab or the North-West Provinces, or the Members of the Viceroy's Council, or even the Governors of Madras and Bombay; because, although I think the latter have not the same claim which the Governors of the Punjab and the North-West Provinces have to leave—being only officers employed, as it were, temporarily in India—I do not feel that the position of Governor of Madras and Bombay, in point of importance and responsibility, differs so much from that of the Governor of Bengal and the North-West Provinces and the Punjab that you can properly draw a distinction between them. I confine my objections, therefore, to the Governor General and the Commander-in-Chief. My Lords, I did not feel so strongly about the Bill last year; I had not had time to consult with others, and I felt a hesitation in throwing any obstacle in the way of the Bill. But, after the weighty observations of my noble Friend, who has himself been Viceroy, and whose opinions are certainly of value in the matter, I trust the

Government will give very careful consideration to the objections which he has raised.

Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 15th February, 1892.

### QUESTIONS.

#### CROWN AGENTS FOR COLONIES.

MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Stockport): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies by whom are the Crown Agents for Colonies, or Agents for Crown Colonies, appointed, and who can remove them ; have they any powers independently of any special powers which may be given to them from time to time by any Crown Colony for general or special purposes ; and, if so, what are those powers ; are Crown Colonies or any other Colonies compelled to make them their agents, or may such Colonies employ other agents in England ; what is their remuneration, and by whom it is paid ; who pays their staff ; and do they pay any, and if so what, rent for the rooms which they and their staff use as offices in the Colonial Office ?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron H. DE WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Crown Agents are appointed and can be removed by the Secretary of State ; but the question of removing them has never had to be considered. They act upon instructions from the Secretary of State or from the Colonial Governments on behalf of whom they act. Beyond this they have no powers, except what may be invested in them by Colonial enactments in particular cases. Crown Colonies are required to employ the Crown Agents, but Colonies having responsible Governments employ their own Agents. The remuneration of the Crown Agents and of their staff is determined by the Secretary of State, and is derived from the payments made by Colonial Governments for the business

transacted by them on scales approved by him. The Crown Agents pay out of the receipts referred to the rent for the use of the rooms occupied by them in the offices in Downing Street, which has been fixed by Her Majesty's Government. On this subject I may refer my hon. Friend to the Parliamentary Paper [C. 3075] of 1881.

#### THE CASE OF THOMAS NUNN.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Nunn, who, at the County of London (North) Sessions on Monday last, having been found guilty of attempting to commit a burglary, was sentenced to five years' penal servitude, and whether there was any sworn evidence before the Court to contradict the statement of the prisoner that since he last came out of prison (about four years ago) he had been "endeavouring to earn an honest living," and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of materially mitigating the severity of the sentence ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): I have made inquiry into the facts of the case. The prisoner was found guilty at the County of London Sessions of attempted burglary, and, on a second indictment, of being in possession of a house breaking implement by night. No evidence was offered at the trial that since his discharge from prison he had been endeavouring to earn an honest living nor did he refer the police to anyone from whom information on this subject could be obtained. The prisoner had been convicted of larceny on four occasions between 1878 and 1883 and of assault in 1889. I am unable to advise any mitigation of the sentence.

#### THE PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACTS, 1885-1888.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what portion of the £10,000,000 sanctioned by the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 1885-1888, remained unappropriated on the coming into operation of "The Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891" ?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): It appears from the Annual Report of the Irish Land Commissioners recently circulated, that up to the 21st August, 1891, they had received, after deducting cases refused, applications for £10,125,703, being £125,703 in excess of the grant of £10,000,000. Of the sum so applied for, they had sanctioned advances to the amount of £8,902,840, thus leaving a sum of £1,097,160 available for applications received which had not then been ruled. The Commissioners now add that further applications were subsequently lodged, with the result that on December 31st, 1891, the pending applications for advances under the Acts of 1885 and 1888 were for £361,584 in excess of the funds provided thereunder.

#### THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

MR. J. ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury with whom the Government have entered into a contract for the reporting of debates and proceedings of the House; whether any opportunity was given to more than one firm to tender for the same; and, if so, whether he will state the names; and whether a copy of such contract will be laid upon the Table, and distributed?

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): The Government have given the contract for the reporting of Parliamentary Debates to Reuter's Telegram Company, Limited. Competition for the contract was invited by advertisements in the public Press. Sixteen tenders for the contract were received; but it would be unusual to publish the names of the unsuccessful tenderers. I will lay a copy of the contract on the Table.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to understand that the contract is definite, or will the House have an opportunity of discussing the matter? I also wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether in the tenders it was specifically stated that advertisements might be taken or not by the contractor and put in at the end of the Reports; and whether, if that be not the case, if it was not stated that advertisements might be taken, whether Messrs. Reuter will have that right or not?

SIR JOHN GORST: The contract is definitely made; but as to the other questions I must have notice to enable me to answer them.

MR. J. ELLIS: May I ask when the contract will be laid on the Table?

SIR JOHN GORST: Immediately.

#### THE FOREST DEPARTMENT (INDIA).

MR. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India have repeatedly supported the claims of the Covenanted Officers of the Forest Department to the same pension rules as their colleagues in the Department of Public Works and Telegraph Department; whether the Secretary of State has withheld his sanction to the concession asked for by them; whether the recruitment of the Forest Department is identical with that of the Public Works and Telegraph Departments by competitive examination and subsequent professional training at Cooper's Hill; and whether the Public Service Commission, locally appointed to inquire into the conditions of the Indian Services, has made the same recommendations as the Government of India?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The statements made in the question are substantially correct; but I should explain that the Secretary of State has not refused his sanction, but is awaiting further information as to the proposals of the Government of India before coming to a decision.

#### THE CIVIL WAR IN CHILI—SHIPMENT OF SPECIE ON BOARD H.M.S. "ESPIEGLE."

MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, East): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is the fact that during the recent Civil War in Chili, Captain Clarke, of H.M.S. *Espeigle*, was induced by the Dictator Balmaceda to convey out of the country 336 bars of silver, valued at 936,824 dollars, which, under an Act of the Chilian Legislature, had been deposited in the Treasury at Santiago, upon an express trust to secure the redemption of the paper currency of the Republic; whether the bullion so conveyed was intended to be used by Balmaceda for the prosecution of the

war and the maintenance of his usurped power; whether Balmaceda had previously applied to the Bank of Valparaíso and to the National Bank of Chili to purchase, and to the Commander of the United States sloop of war *Baltimore* to transport out of the country, this bullion, and whether he had met with a refusal from all of them upon the ground that the same was subject to a trust for the creditors of the Republic; what commission Captain Clarke received for his services, and whether he acted under any and what higher authority; whether the Admiralty Order, authorising the Commanders of British men of war to carry specie belonging to private firms or individuals in time of war, applies to such a case; and whether the action of Captain Clarke has been approved by Her Majesty's Government?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): It is true that Captain Clarke, of H.M.S. *Espígle*, did convey certain specie from Chili to Montevideo. The silver in question was placed at the disposal of the President by an Act of the Chilian Congress. It was not the duty of Her Majesty's officers to inquire into the policy of the proceeding or into the constitutional questions which were in controversy in Chili. The legal title of the existing Chilian Government was universally recognised by Foreign Governments, and the shipment of specie by the Captain of H.M.S. *Espígle* was regular, and in no sense inconsistent with the orders on the Station. There is litigation pending in regard to this question, which makes it undesirable to make any change in the regulations at present; but it is being considered whether any further regulation is not desirable in the case of specie to be conveyed at the instance of a public authority. Under the Orders in Council, the freight payable is 1 per cent. on the value of the specie conveyed, divided in the following proportions:—One quarter to the Admiral on the Station: one half to the Captain and Company of the vessel conveying the treasure; and one quarter to Greenwich Hospital. The Admiral and Captain Clarke have both asked leave to return any sums to which they are entitled. As to the other questions I have no information.

VOL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN: Perhaps the noble Lord can answer the last question but one?

LORD G. HAMILTON: No distinction is made.

MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN: I will take an opportunity of bringing up the whole question in discussion on the Navy Estimates.

#### GALLERY OF BRITISH PICTURES.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can state what progress has been made in the negotiations with Mr. Henry Tate for the erection of a gallery for British pictures?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. R. D. PLUNKET, Dublin University): The Government are anxiously considering the matter referred to in the Question; but the allocation of the ground owned by the Government at South Kensington is a matter, as my hon. Friend will, no doubt, agree, not easy to settle to the full satisfaction of all the interests affected. If my hon. Friend will renew his Question—say a week hence—I hope to be able to give him some definite information.

#### DELIVERY OF MAILS IN COUNTY WICKLOW.

MR. W. CORBET (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he has received an application from residents of the townlands of Knockadreach, Bolinass, Newfarm, and Anagowlawn, in the County of Wicklow, for a delivery of letters at least once a day in those places; and whether he will cause their request to be complied with?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I have received such an application; but inasmuch as the letters which would be affected number only 52 a week, producing a revenue of £5 15s. a year, I regret that it has not been thought proper to comply with it.

#### THE RESTORATION OF USIBEBU.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, with respect to the letter dated the 7th January, 1892, written by the direction of Lord Knutsford to the Secretary of the Aborigines

T



near Egypt, if return to Egypt is considered unadvisable?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: Since the hon. Member placed his Question upon the Paper, two Parliamentary Papers have been distributed, which will probably afford to the hon. Member all the information which he desires upon the subject.

#### SALE OF INDIAN AND COLONIAL STAMPS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that in Sydney, Melbourne, and in other capitals of British Colonies, and in foreign countries, it is possible to buy stamps of the United Kingdom at a small enhancement of price; and whether he will provide similar facilities at the chief London and provincial post offices, and give instructions for the sale of stamps in use in British India and the various British Colonies and Possessions, so as to enable persons in this country to send stamps for replies, or to defray small purchases?

\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (SIR JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): It is not known if the post offices of British Colonies keep for sale stamps of the United Kingdom. It is not thought advisable to purchase and keep for sale in British post offices stamps of India and the Colonies; and the Post Office does all in its power to discourage remittances by postage stamps in letters, because of the temptation thus placed in the way of the sorters and postmen.

#### PRIVATE POST CARDS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he intends to permit the public to use their own postcards (with a halfpenny stamp attached to each), provided that such postcards in size and in every other respect conform to the regulations; and whether he is aware that the cost of postage stamps (to the Government) amounts to only £16 per million, whereas postcards cost them £334 per million?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The question is now under consideration. As a matter of fact, the postcards cost in manufacture not £334, but £283.

*Mr. Cuningham Graham*

#### TECHNICAL AND SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE METROPOLIS.

MR. LAFONE (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the London County Council during the past year applied no part of the sum placed at their disposal from the Beer and Spirit Duties to the purposes of technical and secondary education in the Metropolis; and whether this departure from the practice followed by all the County Councils in England and Wales is in conformity with the provisions of the Customs and Excise Act, 1891, by which large sums were placed at the disposal of the County Council; and, if not, whether it is his intention to take any steps to enforce compliance with the Act?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): I am aware of the fact mentioned in the first part of the hon. Member's Question. The course taken by the London County Council is not out of conformity with the Customs and Excise Act, 1890, which permits, but does not require, the application of the money derived from the Beer and Spirit Duties to technical and secondary education.

#### DRAINAGE OF THE BARROW AND THE BANN.

MR. LEAHY (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that much distress and injury to property has been caused by the flooding of the River Barrow during the present season; and whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session for the drainage of the river?

MR. JACKSON: I must remind the hon. Member that a Bill dealing with the matter mentioned cannot be introduced unless preliminary notices are served upon the owners and occupiers concerned. In two or three successive years the present Government undertook the cost and trouble of carrying out the necessary preliminaries, with a view to legislating for the improvement of certain rivers of Ireland in a comprehensive manner, and which included the case of the river mentioned. These attempts, however, failed to obtain the approval of hon. Members and of the House.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossory): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that last year the present Leader of the House distinctly gave me to understand that if there was a strong desire on the part of the locality in favour of the measure it would be re-introduced? I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that a great amount of illness has arisen from the unsatisfactory condition of the river at Portarlington?

MR. JACKSON: I am not aware of the undertaking to which the hon. Member refers. If the inhabitants of the district are very anxious to have the Bill re-introduced and legislation passed, that emphasises the regret we feel that opposition to the Bill was so strong that we could not carry it through on a former occasion.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will answer the question, of which I have given him private notice, whether there is an intention to re-introduce the Bann Drainage Bill?

MR. JACKSON: I understand the necessary notices have been given, and it is intended to re-introduce the Bill, which we hope will meet with general acceptance.

#### THE GREEN STREET COURT-HOUSE, DUBLIN.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the observations of the Lord Chief Justice in opening the City and County Dublin Commission of Oyer and Terminer on Tuesday last, to the effect that

"If the responsibility for the Court-house was conjoint, the disgrace equally belonged to the Corporation and the Government. To-day it was impossible to move or breathe in the Court. The place was pervaded by a mephitic atmosphere. If he did not find before the next Commission that some practical move was taken to remedy the state of things, he would summon a meeting of the Common Law Judges, and take counsel with his brethren as to whether they could not go elsewhere";

and whether, in view of the universal and long-continued complaints as to the state of Green Street Court-house, the Government intend to take any steps to secure a building in which the law can be administered without danger to the health of those concerned?

MR. JACKSON: The unsatisfactory condition of Green Street Court-house in Dublin has for a considerable time engaged the attention of the Irish Government. So far back as 1883 an arrangement was come to whereby the Government agreed to provide £13,500, the Corporation of Dublin £18,000, and the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin £9,000, the total estimated cost being £40,500. The matter, however, subsequently fell through owing to the Corporation having declined to proceed. The responsibility in the matter, therefore, wholly rests with the Corporation. Should the Corporation now agree, and the Grand Jury be willing to contribute to the extent they formerly agreed, I shall be glad to bring the matter before the Treasury for a renewal of the proposed Government grant of £13,500.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): May I ask why a contribution is expected from the Corporation, who cannot even appoint a Court-keeper? What have the Corporation to do with Green-street Court-house?

MR. JACKSON: I believe the whole responsibility of providing a Court-house rests with the Corporation.

MR. T. M. HEALY: But will the Corporation have any power in relation to the Court-house?

MR. JACKSON: Perhaps the hon. Member will give notice of his question.

#### THE GRANT TO IRISH EDUCATION.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he would disclose his scheme for the distribution of the £200,000 Irish education money, and for the £100,000 left from last year immediately on the conclusion of the Address; and, if not, then on what date?

MR. JACKSON: The distribution of the £200,000 Irish education money will be dealt with in the Bill about to be introduced; and I hope to be in a position at an early date to make proposals with regard to the allocation of the £100,000 for the current year.

COLONEL NOLAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us some information as to the probable determination?

MR. JACKSON: It is not in my power to determine, but it is the intention to introduce a proposal at an early date.

### THE ALBERT UNIVERSITY.

MR. ROBY (Lancashire, S.E., Eccles): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether there is any truth in the reports that the Charter for the Albert University is being re-considered and modified; and when the said Charter will be laid upon the Table of this House?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir W. HART-DYKE, Kent, Dartford): The Draft Charter has not passed out of the hands of the Privy Council, but it is practically settled, and will be laid on the Table during the week.

### THE TRAINING OF THE 5TH BATTALION ROYAL IRISH RIFLES.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a statement that the 5th Battalion Royal Irish Rifles are to be removed for their training, this year, from Downpatrick to Holywood; and if he will give careful consideration to the excellent accommodation available in Downpatrick, where they have always assembled, in order that they may continue to have their quarters in that town?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The lease of the present range at Downpatrick is about to expire. If, however, the same range or another suitable range can be obtained on a yearly agreement, the 5th Battalion Royal Irish Rifles will be trained at Downpatrick this year.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMY SERVICE.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN (Durham, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the Table the Report and Recommendations of the Committee on the Terms of Service in the Army, presided over by Lord Wantage, also the evidence taken before that Committee; and, if so, on what date he expects to be able to do so; and will this be in sufficient time to allow these Papers to be considered by the House previous to the introduction of the Army Estimates this year?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I have now received all portions of the Report of Lord Wantage's Committee, and I pro-

pose to lay it on the Table. The proofs are being corrected, and I hope there will not be much delay in presenting it. I have not received a complete copy of the evidence, and until I do I cannot definitely decide about presenting it, although I should wish to do so.

### DOORKEEPERS, MESSENGERS, AND PORTERS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Circular Letter recently addressed to the Heads of Public Departments by the Comptroller and Auditor General, asking for a Return of the names of all "officers" over 60 years of age serving in such Departments, applies also to doorkeepers, messengers, and porters; and, if not, whether there is any age fixed for the compulsory retirement of such persons?

SIR JOHN GORST: The Circular in question applies only to those persons who come within the definition contained in Clause 1 of the Order in Council of August 15, 1890. No Order in Council has been passed fixing a date for the compulsory retirement of any person not included in the definition.

### WORKHOUSE LABOUR.

MR. ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorgan, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the case of Charles Smith, who on or about 24th January was prosecuted by the authorities of the Strand Union for refusing to complete his task of oakum picking, although he was suffering from very bad varicose veins and ulceration of the legs and an injured thumb, which was dismissed by Sir John Bridge, saying that it was disgraceful that a man in his condition should be brought before the Court; also to the case of Martha Davis, who about the same date was similarly charged by the Wandsworth Union when wholly unfit for the work, which was dismissed by the Magistrate, saying that Martha Davis had been charged with the same offence a day or two before, and that it appeared to have been brought out of spite; and commenting on the practice of the workhouse authorities in bringing the same charges, day after day, in the hope of securing a conviction; and if

he would state to the House what he Local Government Board propose to do in the matter?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. LONG, Wilts, Devizes): The attention of the Local Government Board has been drawn to the case of Charles Smith, and they are in communication with the Guardians of the Strand Union as to the facts. One of the Inspectors of the Board has in the meantime seen the master of the workhouse, and has cautioned him as to his taking unfit cases before the Magistrate. The Board are informed that the case referred to is the first which has been taken by the master of the workhouse before a Magistrate where the Magistrate has not been satisfied that the offence charged has been proved. As regards the case of Martha Davis also, the Board are in communication with the Guardians with the view of obtaining further information as to the facts. With regard to the woman being brought before the Magistrate a second time, I may observe that from the reports which the Board have already received, it appears that when she was before the Magistrate on the first occasion, the case was dismissed because the certificate of the medical officer only stated that she was capable of work in the infirmary, and not that she was equal to the work of washing. The medical officer then gave a certificate that she was capable of doing any laundry work, including washing, and it was under these circumstances that she was brought before the Magistrate the second time. The medical man who examined the woman by direction of the Magistrate came to a different conclusion from that of the medical officer.

#### ARMENIAN PRISONERS.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the statement in the *Daily News* of the 12th instant, from an Armenian correspondent, that the Prison Returns for the Armenian Provinces of Van, Erzeroum, and Moosh show that there are at present something like 700 Armenians awaiting trial in prison as political prisoners; and, should he not possess any information on the subject, will he give instructions for information to be obtained from the

proper quarters; and, in the event of the allegations proving correct, will Her Majesty's Government draw the attention of the Porte to the facts, as the British Government have undertaken special obligations *vis-à-vis* of the Armenian nation?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: No information bearing out the statement referred to has been received at the Foreign Office. Her Majesty's Representative at Constantinople will be asked whether there is any foundation for such a report. Papers with Reports from Her Majesty's Consular Officers on the affairs of Asia Minor will be presented to Parliament.

#### THE CONVICT JAMES M'KEVITT.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether James M'Kevitt, who was convicted at Liverpool in July 1881 for causing a dynamite explosion, is still in prison; what was his sentence; and what prison is he at present confined in?

MR. MATTHEWS: James M'Kevitt is at present undergoing a sentence of 15 years' penal servitude in Chatham prison.

#### IRISH EDUCATION.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has given instructions for the printing of the Return on Irish Education which he laid upon the Table on Wednesday last, and if it can be circulated before his Bill to improve national education in Ireland is introduced?

MR. JACKSON: Sir, I gave instructions last week for the printing of this Return, and for its circulation at the earliest possible moment. I have done everything in my power to hasten it. It is rather a long Return.

#### CROFTER EMIGRATION.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Government intend to send any crofter families as colonists to Western Canada this Spring; if so, how many; to what settlement, Saltcoats, Killarney, or elsewhere; and on what date will they sail; what is the amount of funds available for such purpose at present; and from what

sources is it derived; have the powers of the recently constituted Colonisation Board been in any way extended as to the raising or utilisation of funds for colonisation purposes generally; and do the Government intend to take any action on the lines recommended in the Report of the Colonisation Committee of last year?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): In reply to the first two paragraphs of this question, I have to inform my hon. Friend that the Government have no intention of sending any crofter families to Canada this Spring, there being at present no funds available for the promotion of further colonisation from Scotland. The recently constituted Board have no extended power of raising funds, but as regards utilisation of funds, their powers are extended so as to include Ireland. It is intended, shortly, to ask the House to vote a sum of money to enable the Board to carry out colonisation from Scotland on the lines recommended by the Select Committee last year.

#### IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from how many, and what, counties of Ireland applications for sale and purchase, under "The Land Purchase Act, 1891," were received up to the 31st of December, 1891, by the Irish Land Commission; how many landlords and how many tenants were concerned in these applications; what was the total amount applied for, and what the total, so far, sanctioned; and what issues of stock, if any, have been made?

MR. JACKSON: The Land Commissioners report that applications under the Land Purchase Act of 1891 were received up to December 31st from 22 counties, as follows:—Ulster.—County Antrim—number of applicants—i.e., tenants—2; two estates; total amount applied for £899. Cavan—number of applicants, 6; two estates; total amount applied for, £5,226. Donegal—number of applicants, 2; one estate; total amount applied for, £825. Down—number of applicants, 1; one estate; total amount applied for, £500. Fermanagh—number of applicants, 2;

*Mr. Seton-Karr*

one estate; total amount applied for, £734. Londonderry—number of applicants, 5; four estates; total amount applied for, £3,063. Tyrone—number of applicants, 24; two estates; total amount applied for, £7,517. Total—42 applications; 13 estates; amount applied for, £18,764. Leinster.—Kildare—number of applicants, 18; one estate; amount applied for, £6,260. Kilkenny—number of applicants, 4; two estates; amount applied for £4,230. King's County—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £400. Longford—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £220. Meath—number of applicants, 3; two estates; amount applied for, £1,942. Wexford—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £1,955. Wicklow—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £656. Total—29 applicants; nine estates; amount applied for, £15,703. Munster.—Cork—number of applicants, 6; four estates; amount applied for, £6,074. Kerry—number of applicants, 63; three estates; amount applied for, £25,998. Limerick—number of applicants, 15; four estates; total amount applied for, £4,153. Tipperary—number of applicants, 4; two estates; total amount applied for, £2,371. Waterford—number of applicants, 3; three estates; total amount applied for, £2,920. Total—91 applicants; 16 estates; amount applied for, £41,516. Connaught.—Galway—number of applicants, 2; one estate; total amount applied for, £600. Roscommon—number of applicants, 2; two estates; total amount applied for, £372. Sligo—number of applicants, 9; two estates; total amount applied for, £2,629. Total—13 applicants; five estates; amount applied for, £3,601. Totals for Ireland—175 applications; 43 estates; total amount applied for, £79,584. For the information of the House, I may add that, taking the Return up to January 31st, the total application amounts to £130,000. No cases were sanctioned within the period specified, and no stock has been issued.

#### IRISH RAILWAYS.

MR. COLLERY (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the abandoned state of the works on the Collooney and

Claremorris Railway; if the delay is caused by some technical disagreement between them and the Treasury; and whether, in view of the responsibility entered into (on the faith of promises made by the Government) by the counties of Sligo and Mayo, he will use his influence to bring the matter to a speedy conclusion, so that the works may be resumed and much-needed employment given in a poor and congested district, as well as to arrest the further decay of the existing works?

**SIR JOHN GORST:** My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this question. The matter in dispute between the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company and the Board of Works is now the subject of negotiation. No effort will be spared to bring about a settlement at the earliest possible moment.

#### LADY SUB-COMMISSIONERS.

**MR. SCHWANN** (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Lady Sub-Commissioners have been appointed by the Royal Commission on Labour now sitting to inquire into the conditions under which female labour is carried on in the country; and, if so, whether the Lady Sub-Commissioners will inquire first into the circumstances of female labour in the Metropolis or in the provinces?

**MR. GOSCHEN:** I am asked by my right hon. Friend to answer this question. One of the Commissioners of the Royal Commission on Labour has recommended the appointment of Lady Sub-Commissioners to inquire into the conditions of employment of women in certain industries. The application is now before the Treasury, and is under the consideration of that body.

#### ARMY VETERANS.

**MAJOR RASCH** (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the grant in aid of the survivors of the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns, alluded to last Session, would be available for their widows?

**MR. E. STANHOPE:** I am afraid this could not be done, as soldiers' pensions are never in any case whatever continued to their widows.

**MAJOR RASCH:** I beg to ask the

Secretary of State for War whether he would consider the possibility of granting some pension to old soldiers over 50 years of age who have served 12 years with the colours?

**MR. E. STANHOPE:** Any grant of deferred pensions would require great consideration, as the amount involved is very large; and the system would be directly contrary to the principles of short service and a reserve. I have already announced a limited grant of pensions to men who served in campaigns before 1860; and I am now considering whether it is possible to reduce the period of service which qualifies for such pensions.

#### THE CHILTERN HUNDREDS.

**MR. T. M. HEALY** (North Longford): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the precedents upon which he acted in granting a Member of this House the Chiltern Hundreds while the House was not sitting?

**MR. GOSCHEN:** The dates of the grants, together with the names of the hon. Members during the last ten years, are as follows:—Mr. Sullivan, 3rd February, 1882; Sir Charles Russell, 6th February, 1882; Mr. Finigan, 15th September, 1882; Mr. Cowan, 19th October, 1882; Mr. Bisset, 16th November, 1883; Mr. Holmes, 24th January, 1884; Mr. Cohen, 7th February, 1888; Mr. Lacaita, 7th February, 1888.

#### BRUSHMAKERS' STRIKE IN SHEFFIELD.

**MR. SYDNEY BUXTON** (Tower Hamlets): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in connection with the strike of the Sheffield division of the United Society of Brushmakers, an application has been made to the managers of the Macclesfield Industrial Schools by certain employers for the services of lads from the schools to take the place of those on strike; and, if so, whether he will give instructions that no such application be acceded to, inasmuch as the Industrial School is a State-aided institution?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** I am informed by the Managers of the Macclesfield Industrial Schools that no application has been made to them by employers for the services of lads from the schools to take the place of the

Protection Society, in which it was stated that his Lordship had recently intimated, not for the first time, that he was not prepared to entertain the restoration of Usibebu to the Ndwandwe district, whether he has now any intention of restoring Usibebu or of allowing him to return to that district; and if, before restoring him or allowing him to return, sufficient notice will be given to afford an opportunity of the subject being discussed in Parliament; and whether the exclusion of Usibebu will extend to the exclusion of men who have in the past acted solely under his orders, such as Zuya, Somfula, and others?

**BARON H. DE WORMS:** In reply to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, I have to say that the Secretary of State has not changed his intention with regard to Usibebu since the date of the letter of the 7th of January, to which the hon. Member refers. The answer to the second paragraph of the Question is in the negative.

**MR. COBB:** May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that early in July, 1887, Lord Knutsford, then a Member of this House, assured the House that there was no intention of restoring Usibebu to the district?

**BARON H. DE WORMS:** I do not think I can add anything to the answer I have given. The Secretary of State is not aware of any change of policy. I have answered that since the date of the letter referred to no change has taken place in the policy.

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN RUSSIA.

**MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby):** I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Prime Minister has been called to the treatment by the Russian Government of the members of a very numerous Nonconformist sect in that country called the "Stundists," the integrity and morality of whose lives are generally admitted; whether he is aware that, under the existing Russian law, it is a crime punishable by penal servitude for a Stundist to be found reading the New Testament or praying in company with his co-religionists; whether he is aware that thousands of men and women have recently, for these offences, and for re-

*Mr. Cobb*

fusing to conform to the orthodox religion, been, at the instigation of the prelates and clergy of the Orthodox Church, transported without trial to Siberia, deprived of their children, ruined by heavy fines, flogged, and treated in some respects more harshly than the most depraved criminals; and whether, in the interests of religious freedom, Her Majesty's Government, either alone or in conjunction with the Governments of civilised European nations, will, without delay, remonstrate with the Russian Government upon the course which they are taking?

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith):** According to the *Novoe Vremya*, the main features of the law relating to "Stundists" are the prohibition to build chapels or schools, to hold prayer meetings or assemblies, or to lease mills, manufactories, or public houses. Her Majesty's Government have no information beyond that published in the *Novoe Vremya*. Her Majesty's Government do not propose to address remonstrances to the Russian Government on the subject of the administration of the laws affecting religious sects in cases where the persons affected are not British subjects.

#### GRANTS TO HOSPITALS IN DUBLIN AND BELFAST.

**CAPTAIN MCCALMONT (Antrim, E.):** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in consideration of the fact that a sum of close upon £16,000 is voted annually by Parliament for the maintenance of hospitals in Dublin, he will be prepared to recommend that an annual grant should also be made to similar institutions in Belfast, which are at present of necessity supported entirely by voluntary contributions?

**MR. JACKSON:** I am not aware of any proposal to make grants from public money to the hospitals in Belfast or in other cities in the United Kingdom, nor even if such a proposal were made do I think that it would meet the approval of the House.

#### THE ARTILLERY RANGES, MAPLIN SANDS.

**MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton):** I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treas-

ury whether, in view of the Act of Victoria 25 & 26, c. 36, and in view of the fact that it has been decided by the Court of Appeal, and confirmed by the House of Lords, that certain persons are possessed of a title to portions of the Laplin Sands, which are now in the possession of the Secretary of State for War by virtue of the above Act, it is intended without further delay to proceed to arbitration as to the amount to be paid to them, or to have the amount assessed by a jury according to the provisions of the Artillery Ranges Act, 1862; and whether he can inform the House what is the amount of the legal costs and expenses incurred by the Government in consequence of this litigation?

**THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY** (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): Efforts are still being made to settle by agreement the payment to be made for the ranges in question. The costs paid by the Crown to the defendants amount to £8,071 15s. 7d., and the expenditure by the Crown to £6,740.

#### CRUELTY TO CHILDREN.

**MR. COBB** (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Joseph and Eliza Armistead, people in good circumstances, who on the 7th January last were convicted at the Wandsworth Police Court of ill-treating and neglecting an illegitimate child of the male prisoner seven years of age, when it was proved that for months, from time to time, the child was locked up in the garret or in the coal cellar, unable to get out for the common necessities and wants of humanity, reeking in filth and dirt, without any bed, and fed on dry bread and cold potatoes, and with regard to which the Magistrate, Mr. Montagu Williams, spoke of the case as one of the grossest possible cruelty, and an outrage upon humanity, and said that, except for the action of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, the child might still have been dragging out its miserable existence; whether he is also aware that on the same day, at the Woolwich Police Court, at the instance of the same Society, Alice Moir was convicted of cruelly beating with a hearth brush and a poker, and generally ill-

treating, her two step-daughters, aged 10 and 3½ years, and the Magistrate, Mr. Kennedy, said that it was almost impossible to speak calmly of the prisoner's conduct; whether his attention had been drawn to the fact, that in the first case the full penalty of three months' imprisonment with hard labour was inflicted, and in the second case three months and one month for the two offences; whether he is aware that about the same time Fanny Gane, a girl who was convicted of strangling her newly-born illegitimate child, was sentenced to, and is now undergoing, penal servitude for life; and whether he will communicate with Stipendiary and other Magistrates in different parts of the country, or take any other steps, with a view of amending the law in such a way as to make the punishment more severe in cases of gross cruelty to children, and less severe in cases such as Fanny Gane's?

**\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): The statements in the first four paragraphs of the question are substantially correct. Eliza Armistead and Alice Moir were convicted summarily, and the Magistrates in each case imposed the maximum penalty which the law allows. Fanny Gane was sentenced to death. This sentence was commuted to penal servitude for life, and according to the usual course in cases of infanticide it will be further considerably reduced; but the ultimate reduction granted is not usually announced until sufficient time has elapsed to judge of the conduct of the prisoner and of the effect of prison discipline on her mind. The manner in which cases of infanticide are at present dealt with does not err on the side of severity.

**MR. COBB**: Yes, Sir; but may I ask, is it contemplated to make the punishment more severe in cases of gross cruelty to children?

**MR. MATTHEWS**: No; I do not propose to ask the House to amend the Act passed in 1889.

#### ARABI PASHA.

**MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM** (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if Her Majesty's Government would take into consideration the removal of Arabi Pasha to Cyprus, or some better climate



and attention to a question has a right to be attacked, and to have his word and good faith impugned by a Gentleman speaking from official information.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (MR. GEORGE CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I certainly had not the other evening any intention of being in the least discourteous to the hon. Gentleman, still less of imputing culpable negligence to him in any form that could be considered offensive by himself. I am glad he has called my attention to his fact, and that he has given me his authority for the figures he used. The other night the only authority he gave when I asked him was the electioneering speeches delivered by two gentlemen in 1885.

MR. MAC NEILL: I did not quote the electioneering speeches for that statement, but for a statement that out of 900 Uncovenanted Service appointments only nine were held by natives.

MR. CURZON: I am sorry to have imperfectly understood the hon. Gentleman, but he will now understand my reason for regarding with suspicion his authority the other night. I am glad the figures he quoted came from the Blue Book, and I am obliged to him for making the explanation he has now done.

MR. MAC NEILL: Mr. Speaker which is correct now?

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [9th February]—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

We take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the afflicting dispensation of Providence with  
*Mr. Swift Mac Neill*

which Your Majesty and this Nation have been visited, in the death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale:

We assure Your Majesty of our heartfelt participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Your Majesty's family under this grievous affliction and in the deep sense entertained by all classes of your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which the country has sustained by the loss of a Prince who had won for himself the general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."—(*Mr. Hermon Hodge.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

(4.23.) MR. SEXTON (West Belfast), in rising to move as an Amendment to the Address, at end, to add,—

"We deem it our duty to acquaint your Majesty that a decisive majority of the Irish people, and of their representatives in this House, are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as her distinctive interests require, and that this conviction has been intensified by the manifest failure of the Land Purchase Act of 1881 to afford an acceptable basis for the extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland,"

said: at the advanced stage which the Debate on the Address has reached I think it needful to refer to one passage in the Speech from the Throne, and even this reference I should not have been compelled to make if it had not appeared to me that there is a serious discord and an air of contradiction between the passage in question and some recent speeches of the Principal Minister of the Crown. Sir, we are told in the Royal Speech that proposals will be laid before us for applying to Ireland the general principles affecting Local Government already adopted in Great Britain. Now, the fundamental principle of the scheme of Local Government adopted in Great Britain is that the majority have the right to rule; that the majority of the electors shall dictate the composition of the Local Governing Bodies, and that the majority of the Local Governing Bodies shall dictate the course of the administration of their affairs. I must say I can discover no satisfactory accord between that declaration in the Speech from the Throne and the observations affecting Ireland in the speech of Lord Salisbury at Exeter, a speech which has already been referred to in this Debate. I confess I thought it rather hard that the First Lord of the Treasury, who has otherwise

quite enough to do, should have to defend an orator so erratic and unruly as the Prime Minister. However, Sir, I am bound to say, in justice to the First Lord, that he associated himself as little as possible with the speech of the Prime Minister. He began by saying he had not read it. That did no credit to his powers of defence—at any rate, it was not a brilliant defence. For my own part, I should have been inclined to take no notice of any language that Lord Salisbury might apply to Ireland. We have had some experience of him. It is not so long ago since he compared the Irish people to Hottentots; he said that we were addicted to crime; he said that the only way of dealing with us was by firm and resolute government, and now we understand from actual experience what is meant by that famous phrase. Sir, it means the suppression for ever of the ordinary rights of the community and of the rights and privileges granted by the British Constitution. It means, as to administration, that every official is to be encouraged to attack the rights of the people, that if he is challenged at law he will be defended out of the public purse; that his own word will be taken as final in the matter of guilt or innocence; and that all demands for investigation are to be spurned. These being the acts of Lord Salisbury, why should we be surprised at his language? Sir, I shall be content to leave to the electors of this country, whose opportunity will shortly come, the question whether the language of insult towards the creed of vast multitudes of the people of this realm befitted the Prime Minister of Great Britain. It strikes me that the language of Lord Salisbury at Exeter was something more than mere general declamation. I know that Lord Salisbury is a scoffer by nature, that he is a bigot by calculation, and that he will not consent to bridle his tongue when his party so desire. He will denounce the religion of the Roman Catholics to-day and court their votes to-morrow, according as it suits his purpose. When I read the language of Lord Salisbury at Exeter I asked, What is his present and immediate object? What is the meaning of this elaborate attempt to exalt the minority and insult and degrade in public estimation the majority of the Irish people? Sir, the conclusion at which I arrived was that the Prime

Minister was endeavouring to influence the course of public opinion in respect to the Local Government Bill. Lord Salisbury has turned history upside down, has inverted his facts to suit his purposes. So far from it being true that the Catholics of Ireland exhibited an attitude of hostility towards the Government of England (which well deserved it), their great historical fault has been in, regard to the Government of this country, that they have been too patient, too submissive. If they have made progress, and if they are likely to make more, it is due to the fact that they have had much suffering, and they have learned much in the past. The Irish Catholics of the present day are men of keener judgment than their forefathers, and of more penetrating insight into political affairs. They are more stern and persistent, and it is with these qualifications that Lord Salisbury and all concerned will have to take account in their future transactions affecting Ireland. How was it Lord Salisbury described the majority of the Irish people? The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, who was very careful and guarded in his speech the other day, treated the speech of the Prime Minister as if he had only said that the rich in Ireland were the few, and that the poor were the many. But the Prime Minister said a great deal more. He said the majority contained all that is backward and unprosperous, and all that is opposed to civilisation and enlightenment. Now, what does the minority contain? It contains the Irish landlords. When you remember what they have been and what they have done, what great powers they have misused, what splendid opportunities they have wasted for promoting civilisation and enlightenment, how they have squandered their substance, how they have been the plague of Ireland and the disgrace of this Empire, do I go too far, in the view of any impartial mind, when I say that the landlords of Ireland have shown themselves to be the most backward and the most unprogressive body of men not only in Ireland, but in Europe? Its idea of enlightenment is to perpetuate sectarian rancour by keeping alive the passions of a religious quarrel that ended two centuries ago. It contains all those whose idea of civilisation is to resist—no, not to resist, to threaten to resist

—the grant by the Imperial Parliament and the Crown of a free Constitution to Ireland. If the majority in Ireland contain an element that is rather backward and unprosperous, to what is that due? It is due to the fact that you have, for generations, deliberately exploited their country in the interests of an intruded class, in the interests of a class to whom you gave legal power over the means of the livelihood of the people, and who use that power without stint and ruth to strip the people bare and keep them in a state of abject poverty. The true cause of the backwardness of Ireland was stated in an earlier and a wiser speech of Lord Salisbury, when he said that it was due, not to the Celtic race, to the Catholic Creed, nor to the democratic sentiment of Ireland, but to the fact that the British Government existed in Ireland, and that an alien rule had cast a blight upon the life of the people. Those of the Irish majority who have been able to make their way outside the sphere of British rule to any other country in the world, where the chance of fair play existed, or even inside the sphere of British rule, but outside the circle of Irish maladministration, have shown that they are as able to prosper as well as any other men, and that they are fully alive to, and not opposed to, civilisation and enlightenment. The backwardness of Ireland, so far as it exists, is due solely to her poverty. Her poverty is directly due to the necessary effect of your agrarian policy, and you cannot attempt, in regard to this question of Local Government, to make this wrongdoing in the past, and in the present, a justification for committing further injustice. The First Lord of the Treasury was more guarded in his own opinion than the Prime Minister, but his observations equally challenged notice. I am at a loss to understand why he brought in the question of Ulster. He spoke of Ulster as if it were a political unit. But it is nothing of the kind. The other three provinces of Ireland are political units, but Ulster is not a political unit, and, what is more, it never will be. Ulster is represented in this House by 33 Members, of whom 16 are adherents of the Government and 17 are Nationalists. It is true the four Eastern Counties have a majority of Protestants, but the five Western

*Mr. Sexton*

Counties contain a heavy majority, which is Catholic, Celtic, and Nationalist. Why, therefore, the First Lord of the Treasury should have brought in Ulster, in view of the facts I have stated, which can lead to no inference unfavourable to our view of Home Rule and Local Government, is more than I can attempt to explain. But the First Lord of the Treasury has evolved out of his own reflection another delusion which may be corrected by a very little inquiry. He stated in his speech the other night, that the line of division of political opinion in Ireland corresponds with the line of demarcation between backwardness and progress—very ingenious, truly, and very convenient for the Government, no doubt; but I submit that the contrary is the case. If the right hon. Gentleman meant to refer to education, I can tell him that the Irish Catholics, class for class, are now as well educated as Protestants, and they have proved themselves well able to hold their own in every form of contest and competition, and in every walk of life. They are as well educated as the rank which resorts to the University, or as the children of the peasant who resort to the National School. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend to speak of wealth? Again, I say the landlords of Ireland, their connections and dependents, are the marrow and substance of the minority. But many of them are in a condition of insolvency. Most of them have nothing to spare, and the few amongst them that can be called men of wealth have no more claim to be counted than is justified by what they draw from Ireland, which they spend, together with their lives, in England or in some other country. Let not the right hon. Gentleman forget that eleven years ago the Irish tenant acquired by law the legal proprietorship of the soil. I have no doubt that if a precise valuation could be made of the assets of every Irishman in Ireland, and his debts deducted from it, it would be found that, poor as the people undoubtedly are—poverty, however, is a relative term, and better than insolvency—the majority of them now hold in their hands the greater part of the real, actual, and genuine value and capital of the country. If the right hon. Gentleman choose to get a Return from the London Insurance Companies, and from other persons who have loaned

money on Irish land which has not been paid, and that were laid on the Table, would be seen that the money lent to the Irish landlords, and not repaid, shabby amounts to very nearly the fee-able value, at the present moment, of the entire soil of Ireland. So much for the theory of the right hon. Gentleman—at the line of political division of opinion corresponds to the line of demarcation between backwardness and progress. I would respectfully invite him, specially in these matters of practical legislation where precision is so important, not to found himself upon baseless story notoriously at variance with the facts. If these two Ministers, the Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury, intended by their speech, and by their attack on the majority of the Irish people and their elaborate praises of the minority, to convey that the proposals made before us in regard to Ireland would allow the majority to rule, their way of expressing that view is so exceedingly indirect that I may be pardoned for entertaining some doubt upon that point. If, on the other hand, the Prime Minister and the First Lord meant that they will not apply to Ireland the rule that they apply to England—that the minority in Ireland is to be fortified or protected, and that the majority is to be rebuffed and checked—then it would have been more frank to have advised the Sovereign not to tell the House that proposals would be made on the same general principles already adopted in Great Britain, but that the principles adopted here are opposed to those they intend to apply to Ireland. However, we shall very freely be able to judge of it as soon as we see the Bill; but, in the meantime, I think it necessary that a statement proceeding from so high an authority, and intended perhaps to have a covert bearing upon immediate legislation, should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Sir, in the Amendment which I now move I invite the House to inform the Sovereign that a decisive majority of the Irish people, and of their Representatives in this House, are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as her distinctive circumstances require, and that this conviction has been intensified by the manifest failure of the Land Purchase Act of 1891, to afford an acceptable basis for the

extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland. I do not endeavour in my Amendment to define precisely the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate well for Ireland, because I think it comprises more what physicians call a complication of disorders. It proceeds from profound ignorance of Ireland, an ignorance which I may as well say is incurable, because you are resolved not to take advice; and it proceeds partly from prejudice, which is certainly not upon the decrease among the Party opposite. That inability, also, in a great measure proceeds from the increasing strain and pressure of the duties of this Parliament, and that is a cause which will not diminish, but must increase, as time goes on. It will be observed that I do not invite from this House any declaration as to the right of Ireland to a separate Legislature. The judgment of Ireland upon that subject is quite enough for me; and the judgment of Ireland is undoubtedly that, even if your legislation for her interests were as good as it is bad; that circumstance would not affect her natural and historic right, which she is, under all circumstances, determined to maintain. I do not even ask you to declare upon the expediency of a separate Legislature for Ireland. That is a question for the electors of the country, which will presently come before them, and to them I am content to leave it. I do not raise any debate upon this occasion upon any specific scheme of Home Rule. I think the gallant Gentleman opposite must admit that it would be idle for me to do so in the presence of a trenchant majority which is firmly pledged to opposition to any and all Home Rule, and also committed by its own legislative act to the perpetual coercion of Ireland. It would be idle to raise discussion now; but the time for it will come very shortly, when the Minister vested with the power of conferring a Parliamentary Constitution upon Ireland proceeds to invite the House of Commons to execute the will of the country. I am not moved by the circumstance, of which I am well aware, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is athirst for particulars, and I know very well what he did with particulars when he had them before. He affected to accept the principle, but he used the particulars to attack the principle. He attacked the

sources is it derived; have the powers of the recently constituted Colonisation Board been in any way extended as to the raising or utilisation of funds for colonisation purposes generally; and do the Government intend to take any action on the lines recommended in the Report of the Colonisation Committee of last year?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): In reply to the first two paragraphs of this question, I have to inform my hon. Friend that the Government have no intention of sending any crofter families to Canada this Spring, there being at present no funds available for the promotion of further colonisation from Scotland. The recently constituted Board have no extended power of raising funds, but as regards utilisation of funds, their powers are extended so as to include Ireland. It is intended, shortly, to ask the House to vote a sum of money to enable the Board to carry out colonisation from Scotland on the lines recommended by the Select Committee last year.

#### IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from how many, and what, counties of Ireland applications for sale and purchase, under "The Land Purchase Act, 1891," were received up to the 31st of December, 1891, by the Irish Land Commission; how many landlords and how many tenants were concerned in these applications; what was the total amount applied for, and what the total, so far, sanctioned; and what issues of stock, if any, have been made?

MR. JACKSON: The Land Commissioners report that applications under the Land Purchase Act of 1891 were received up to December 31st from 22 counties, as follows:—Ulster.—County Antrim—number of applicants—i.e., tenants—2; two estates; total amount applied for £899. Cavan—number of applicants, 6; two estates; total amount applied for, £5,226. Donegal—number of applicants, 2; one estate; total amount applied for, £825. Down—number of applicants, 1; one estate; total amount applied for, £500. Fermanagh—number of applicants, 2;

*Mr. Seton-Karr*

one estate; total amount applied for, £734. Londonderry—number of applicants, 5; four estates; total amount applied for, £3,063. Tyrone—number of applicants, 24; two estates; total amount applied for, £7,517. Total—42 applications; 13 estates; amount applied for, £18,764. Leinster.—Kildare—number of applicants, 18; one estate; amount applied for, £6,260. Kilkenny—number of applicants, 4; two estates; amount applied for £4,230. King's County—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £400. Longford—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £220. Meath—number of applicants, 3; two estates; amount applied for, £1,942. Wexford—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £1,955. Wicklow—number of applicants, 1; one estate; amount applied for, £656. Total—29 applicants; nine estates; amount applied for, £15,703. Munster.—Cork—number of applicants, 6; four estates; amount applied for, £6,074. Kerry—number of applicants, 63; three estates; amount applied for, £25,998. Limerick—number of applicants, 15; four estates; total amount applied for, £4,153. Tipperary—number of applicants, 4; two estates; total amount applied for, £2,371. Waterford—number of applicants, 3; three estates; total amount applied for, £2,920. Total—91 applicants; 16 estates; amount applied for, £41,516. Connaught.—Galway—number of applicants, 2; one estate; total amount applied for, £600. Roscommon—number of applicants, 2; two estates; total amount applied for, £372. Sligo—number of applicants, 9; two estates; total amount applied for, £2,629. Total—13 applicants; five estates; amount applied for, £3,601. Totals for Ireland—175 applications; 43 estates; total amount applied for, £79,584. For the information of the House, I may add that, taking the Return up to January 31st, the total application amounts to £130,000. No cases were sanctioned within the period specified, and no stock has been issued.

#### IRISH RAILWAYS.

MR. COLLERY (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the abandoned state of the works on the Collooney and

aremorris Railway; if the delay is used by some technical disagreement between them and the Treasury; and either, in view of the responsibility tered into (on the faith of promises ide by the Government) by the counties Sligo and Mayo, he will use his fluence to bring the matter to a speedy nclusion, so that the works may be sumed and much-needed employment ren in a poor and congested district, as ll as to arrest the further decay of the isting works?

SIR JOHN GORST: My right hon. iend has asked me to answer this estion. The matter in dispute between e Waterford and Limerick Railway mpany and the Board of Works is w the subject of negotiation. No ort will be spared to bring about settlement at the earliest possible oment.

#### LADY SUB-COMMISSIONERS.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the treasury whether Lady Sub-Commissioners have been appointed by the oyal Commission on Labour now ting to inquire into the conditions ader which female labour is carried on the country; and, if so, whether the dy Sub-Commissioners will inquire st into the circumstances of female our in the Metropolis or in the ovinces?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am asked by y right hon. Friend to answer this estion. One of the Commissioners of e Royal Commission on Labour has ommended the appointment of Lady ub-Commissioners to inquire into the nditions of employment of women in rtain industries. The application is ow before the Treasury, and is nder the consideration of that body.

#### ARMY VETERANS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I g to ask the Secretary of State for ar whether the grant in aid of the rrvors of the Crimean and Indian lutiny campaigns, alluded to last Ses- ion, would be available for their widows?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I am afraid is could not be done, as soldiers' pen- ons are never in any case whatever con- ued to their widows.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the

Secretary of State for War whether he would consider the possibility of grant- ing some pension to old soldiers over 50 years of age who have served 12 years with the colours?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Any grant of deferred pensions would require great consideration, as the amount involved is very large; and the system would be directly contrary to the principles of short service and a reserve. I have already announced a limited grant of pensions to men who served in campaigns before 1860; and I am now considering whether it is possible to reduce the period of service which qualifies for such pensions.

#### THE CHILTERN HUNDREDS.

MR. T. M. HEALY (North Longford): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Ex- chequer what are the precedents upon which he acted in granting a Member of this House the Chiltern Hundreds while the House was not sitting?

MR. GOSCHEN: The dates of the grants, together with the names of the hon. Members during the last ten years, are as follows:—Mr. Sullivan, 3rd February, 1882; Sir Charles Russell, 6th February, 1882; Mr. Finigan, 15th September, 1882; Mr. Cowan, 19th October, 1882; Mr. Bisset, 16th November, 1883; Mr. Holmes, 24th January, 1884; Mr. Cohen, 7th February, 1888; Mr. Lacaita, 7th February, 1888.

#### BRUSHMAKERS' STRIKE IN SHEFFIELD.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in connection with the strike of the Sheffield division of the United Society of Brushmakers, an application has been made to the managers of the Macclesfield Industrial Schools by certain employers for the services of lads from the schools to take the place of those on strike; and, if so, whether he will give instructions that no such application be acceded to, inasmuch as the Industrial School is a State-aided institution?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am informed by the Managers of the Macclesfield Industrial Schools that no appli- cation has been made to them by employers for the services of lads from the schools to take the place of the

brushmakers on strike. The Managers have been told that if such an application be made to them, it must at once be refused.

#### THE INSURANCE OF CHILDREN.

COLONEL DAWNAY (York, Thirsk Division): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Her Majesty's Government will take steps to pass a Bill, similar to the one brought forward last Session, to amend and regulate the Laws relating to the insurance of children?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. Friend I have to remind him that this Bill, which was introduced into the House of Lords last year, was sent to a Committee, which took evidence, but gave no Report on the merits of the Bill. I am afraid that, under these circumstances, and without myself expressing any opinion on the merits of the Bill, it would not be possible for us to add to our already considerable programme of legislation.

#### COMMISSIONS IN THE ROYAL ARTILLERY.

MR. E. STANHOPE: As some misconception appears to have arisen in regard to the answer given by me on Thursday last to a question put by my hon. Friend the Member for the Basingstoke Division, I would like, with the permission of the House, to explain that my reply applied only to Militia Artillery candidates for commissions in the Royal Artillery. As regards the other Militia candidates, looking at all the circumstances of the case, I have come to the conclusion that the reduction was somewhat excessive, and I have accordingly added 10 to the number which had been announced for competition.

#### THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he would consider the propriety of extending the district of Luvally, which has been scheduled as a congested district, so as to include that portion of the outskirts of Tuam which contains the Curragh Mills; and if he would consider the question of re-opening these wood mills under the control or with the assistance of the Congested Board?

*Mr. Matthews*

MR. JACKSON (Leeds, N.): The Congested Districts Board will, I have no doubt, consider the expediency of recommending what the hon. Member suggests.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is it the case that a selection without competition is to be made from Land Commission and Census Clerks for the Congested Districts Board vacancies; and as these officers were originally nominated by the Viceroy subject to examinations, will the Government consider the advisability of filling these posts by competition amongst the clerks in question, so as to avoid apprehensions arising under a system of mere nomination?

MR. JACKSON: The staff of the Congested Districts Board is very limited in number, and the persons appointed to it were selected by the Lord Lieutenant by reason of the experience they possessed in the discharge of cognate duties.

MR. T. M. HEALY: If these gentlemen were so experienced it would have been easy for them to have passed a competitive examination. Why does the Government lay itself open to the charge of favouritism in these appointments?

MR. JACKSON: The members of the staff were appointed, as I have said, because of their experience. They were not nominees of the Lord Lieutenant. They were appointed on the recommendation of the Congested Districts Board.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I would ask whether with the view of dissipating the impression of favouritism that now prevails as to the selection, the staff of the Land Commission and Census Departments would be allowed to compete for these appointments?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, South): Am I right in saying the appointments were made on the recommendation of the Congested Districts Board?

MR. T. M. HEALY: On the recommendation of the hon. Gentleman himself.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, Sir; I believe the appointments were all made on the recommendation of the Congested Districts Board.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Did the hon. Member for South Tyrone make any recommendation?

MR. JACKSON: No,

MR. T. M. HEALY : We know he did.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order !

#### PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN KENT.

MR. E. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN (Rochester) : I should like to ask my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Agriculture whether there is any truth in the report appearing in this morning's newspapers to the effect that there has been an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Kent ?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (MR. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) : It is true that a report has been received by the Board of Agriculture to the effect that the disease has spread from the metropolitan area to the neighbourhood of Sittingbourne, in Kent. I find from further inquiries this morning that the outbreak occurred at Minster, in the Island of Sheppey. There are 14 animals, affected out of a herd of 36 animals which have been known to be in contact with a number of other animals on the marshes in that district. An Order has in consequence been passed this morning prohibiting the removal of the animals from the Island of Sheppey, and cutting it off from other parts of the country.

MR. PICTON (Leicester) : Was the source of contagion traced ?

MR. CHAPLIN : So far as we know, the outbreak has been traced to an animal which left the Metropolitan market before the disease was discovered last week.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS (WAGES).

Moved an Address for "Return of the firms issued by the War Office, Admiralty, Board of Works, and other Departments of the Government, in compliance with the terms of the Resolution of the House of 13th February, 1891."—(Mr. Sydney Buxton.)

Motion agreed to.

#### OMISSION OF A MEMBER'S VOTE.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's Co. Ossory) : I wish to call the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, and of the House, to an omission in the Journals of the House of last Friday which affects me, and which I think you will see ought to be corrected. I voted on that occasion under considerable difficulty, owing to indisposition, in favour of the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Waterford, on behalf of the release of

the treason felony prisoners, and my name does not appear in the Division. I wish to express a desire that the correction should be made. I certainly voted on that occasion, as I walked through the Lobby with my hon. Friend the Member for Monaghan, who will no doubt testify to the accuracy of my statement. I gave my name as usual, and I also gave the name of my constituency. I think it is possible that the clerk did not hear the name of the constituency, for the name of Dr. Roderick Macdonald is recorded. He is represented as having voted, and I do not think he did vote.

MR. SPEAKER : The matter will of course be rectified, and an erratum will be inserted in the Journals.

#### A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. SWIFT MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.) : I wish to make a personal explanation in reference to a certain matter that occurred on Friday evening. I moved an Amendment to the Address relating to the Indian Councils, and I made certain statements of what I considered a very serious character in regard to Indian officials. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India contradicted me very flatly and very thoroughly, and in such a way as to impute to me culpable negligence in the statement of facts, and in likewise bringing forward matters without proper and sufficient investigation. If I were guilty of such conduct I should be unworthy of being a Member of this House, and therefore I would like to say that my statements were made after the most careful investigation. For example, I said that out of 2,367 appointments held by the higher grade of the Uncovenanted Civil Service, only 188 were held by natives. The Under Secretary contradicted me flatly, accused me of ignorance, and said the reverse was the fact—that there were only 188 Europeans, and that all the others were natives. Sir, I made a similar statement two years ago from my place in this House, and the hon. Gentleman the then Under Secretary for India did not then contradict me. My authority was the Public Service Commission Report, where, in pages 92 to 134, every word and syllable of what I stated is to be found. I looked over the matter with the assistance of Mr. William Digby, political officer. No man who gives time



and attention to a question has a right to be attacked, and to have his word and good faith impugned by a Gentleman speaking from official information.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. GEORGE CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I certainly had not the other evening any intention of being in the least discourteous to the hon. Gentleman, still less of imputing culpable negligence to him in any form that could be considered offensive by himself. I am glad he has called my attention to his fact, and that he has given me his authority for the figures he used. The other night the only authority he gave when I asked him was the electioneering speeches delivered by two gentlemen in 1885.

MR. MAC NEILL: I did not quote the electioneering speeches for that statement, but for a statement that out of 900 Uncovenanted Service appointments only nine were held by natives.

MR. CURZON: I am sorry to have imperfectly understood the hon. Gentleman, but he will now understand my reason for regarding with suspicion his authority the other night. I am glad the figures he quoted came from the Blue Book, and I am obliged to him for making the explanation he has now done.

MR. MAC NEILL: Mr. Speaker which is correct now?

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [9th February]—"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth:—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

We take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the afflicting dispensation of Providence with  
*Mr. Swift Mac Neill*

which Your Majesty and this Nation been visited, in the death of His Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale:

We assure Your Majesty of our hearty participation in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Majesty's family under this grievous affliction, and in the deep sense entertained by all of your Majesty's subjects of the calamity which the country has sustained by the death of a Prince who had won for himself general affection and regard of Your Majesty's subjects."—(*Mr. Hermon Hodge.*)

Main Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

(4.23.) MR. SEXTON (West Belfast) in rising to move as an Amendment to the Address, at end, to add,—

"We deem it our duty to acquaint Your Majesty that a decisive majority of the people, and of their representatives in the House, are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland, her distinctive interests require, and that conviction has been intensified by the marked failure of the Land Purchase Act of 1885 to afford an acceptable basis for the extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland."

MR. SEXTON said: at the advanced stage which the Debate on the Address has reached I thought it needful to refer to one passage in the Speech from the Throne, and even to make reference I should not have been compelled to make if it had not appeared to me that there is a serious discord and an air of contradiction between the passages in question and some recent speeches of the Principal Minister of the Crown. Sir, we are told in the Royal Speech that proposals will be laid before us for applying to Ireland the general principles affecting Local Government already adopted in Great Britain. Now, the fundamental principle of the scheme of Local Government adopted in Great Britain is that the majority have the right to rule; that the majority of the electors shall decide the composition of the Local Governing Bodies, and that the majority of the Local Governing Bodies shall dictate the course of the administration of the affairs. I must say I can discover no satisfactory accord between that declaration in the Speech from the Throne and the observations affecting Ireland in the speech of Lord Salisbury at Exeter which has already been referred to in this Debate. I confess I thought it rather hard that the First Secretary of the Treasury, who has other

quite enough to do, should have to defend an orator so erratic and unruly as the Prime Minister. However, Sir, I am bound to say, in justice to the First Lord, that he associated himself as little as possible with the speech of the Prime Minister. He began by saying he had not read it. That did no credit to his powers of defence—at any rate, it was not a brilliant defence. For my own part, I should have been inclined to take no notice of any language that Lord Salisbury might apply to Ireland. We have had some experience of him. It is not so long ago since he compared the Irish people to Hottentots; he said that we were addicted to crime; he said that the only way of dealing with us was by firm and resolute government, and now we understand from actual experience what is meant by that famous phrase. Sir, it means the suppression for ever of the ordinary rights of the community and of the rights and privileges granted by the British Constitution. It means, as to administration, that every official is to be encouraged to attack the rights of the people, that if he is challenged at law he will be defended out of the public purse; that his own word will be taken as final in the matter of guilt or innocence; and that all demands for investigation are to be spurned. These being the acts of Lord Salisbury, why should we be surprised at his language? Sir, I shall be content to leave to the electors of this country, whose opportunity will shortly come, the question whether the language of insult towards the creed of vast multitudes of the people of this realm befitted the Prime Minister of Great Britain. It strikes me that the language of Lord Salisbury at Exeter was something more than mere general declamation. I know that Lord Salisbury is a scoffer by nature, that he is a bigot by calculation, and that he will not consent to bridle his tongue when his party so desire. He will denounce the religion of the Roman Catholics to-day and court their votes to-morrow, according as it suits his purpose. When I read the language of Lord Salisbury at Exeter I asked, What is his present and immediate object? What is the meaning of this elaborate attempt to enalt the minority and insult and degrade in public estimation the majority of the Irish people? Sir, the conclusion at which I arrived was that the Prime

Minister was endeavouring to influence the course of public opinion in respect to the Local Government Bill. Lord Salisbury has turned history upside down, has inverted his facts to suit his purposes. So far from it being true that the Catholics of Ireland exhibited an attitude of hostility towards the Government of England (which well deserved it), their great historical fault has been in, regard to the Government of this country, that they have been too patient, too submissive. If they have made progress, and if they are likely to make more, it is due to the fact that they have had much suffering, and they have learned much in the past. The Irish Catholics of the present day are men of keener judgment than their forefathers, and of more penetrating insight into political affairs. They are more stern and persistent, and it is with these qualifications that Lord Salisbury and all concerned will have to take account in their future transactions affecting Ireland. How was it Lord Salisbury described the majority of the Irish people? The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, who was very careful and guarded in his speech the other day, treated the speech of the Prime Minister as if he had only said that the rich in Ireland were the few, and that the poor were the many. But the Prime Minister said a great deal more. He said the majority contained all that is backward and unprosperous, and all that is opposed to civilisation and enlightenment. Now, what does the minority contain? It contains the Irish landlords. When you remember what they have been and what they have done, what great powers they have misused, what splendid opportunities they have wasted for promoting civilisation and enlightenment, how they have squandered their substance, how they have been the plague of Ireland and the disgrace of this Empire, do I go too far, in the view of any impartial mind, when I say that the landlords of Ireland have shown themselves to be the most backward and the most unprogressive body of men not only in Ireland, but in Europe? Its idea of enlightenment is to perpetuate sectarian rancour by keeping alive the passions of a religious quarrel that ended two centuries ago. It contains all those whose idea of civilisation is to resist—no, not to resist, to threaten to resist

—the grant by the Imperial Parliament and the Crown of a free Constitution to Ireland. If the majority in Ireland contain an element that is rather backward and unprosperous, to what is that due? It is due to the fact that you have, for generations, deliberately exploited their country in the interests of an intruded class, in the interests of a class to whom you gave legal power over the means of the livelihood of the people, and who use that power without stint and ruth to strip the people bare and keep them in a state of abject poverty. The true cause of the backwardness of Ireland was stated in an earlier and a wiser speech of Lord Salisbury, when he said that it was due, not to the Celtic race, to the Catholic Creed, nor to the democratic sentiment of Ireland, but to the fact that the British Government existed in Ireland, and that an alien rule had cast a blight upon the life of the people. Those of the Irish majority who have been able to make their way outside the sphere of British rule to any other country in the world, where the chance of fair play existed, or even inside the sphere of British rule, but outside the circle of Irish maladministration, have shown that they are as able to prosper as well as any other men, and that they are fully alive to, and not opposed to, civilisation and enlightenment. The backwardness of Ireland, so far as it exists, is due solely to her poverty. Her poverty is directly due to the necessary effect of your agrarian policy, and you cannot attempt, in regard to this question of Local Government, to make this wrongdoing in the past, and in the present, a justification for committing further injustice. The First Lord of the Treasury was more guarded in his own opinion than the Prime Minister, but his observations equally challenged notice. I am at a loss to understand why he brought in the question of Ulster. He spoke of Ulster as if it were a political unit. But it is nothing of the kind. The other three provinces of Ireland are political units, but Ulster is not a political unit, and, what is more, it never will be. Ulster is represented in this House by 33 Members, of whom 16 are adherents of the Government and 17 are Nationalists. It is true the four Eastern Counties have a majority of Protestants, but the five Western

*Mr. Sexton*

Counties contain a heavy majority, which is Catholic, Celtic, and Nationalist. Why, therefore, the First Lord of the Treasury should have brought in Ulster, in view of the facts I have stated, which can lead to no inference unfavourable to our view of Home Rule and Local Government, is more than I can attempt to explain. But the First Lord of the Treasury has evolved out of his own reflection another delusion which may be corrected by a very little inquiry. He stated in his speech the other night, that the line of division of political opinion in Ireland corresponds with the line of demarcation between backwardness and progress—very ingenious, truly, and very convenient for the Government, no doubt; but I submit that the contrary is the case. If the right hon. Gentleman meant to refer to education, I can tell him that the Irish Catholics, class for class, are now as well educated as Protestants, and they have proved themselves well able to hold their own in every form of contest and competition, and in every walk of life. They are as well educated as the rank which resorts to the University, or as the children of the peasant who resort to the National School. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend to speak of wealth? Again, I say the landlords of Ireland, their connections and dependents, are the marrow and substance of the minority. But many of them are in a condition of insolvency. Most of them have nothing to spare, and the few amongst them that can be called men of wealth have no more claim to be counted than is justified by what they draw from Ireland, which they spend, together with their lives, in England or in some other country. Let not the right hon. Gentleman forget that eleven years ago the Irish tenant acquired by law the legal proprietorship of the soil. I have no doubt that if a precise valuation could be made of the assets of every Irishman in Ireland, and his debts deducted from it, it would be found that, poor as the people undoubtedly are—poverty, however, is a relative term, and better than insolvency—the majority of them now hold in their hands the greater part of the real, actual, and genuine value and capital of the country. If the right hon. Gentleman choose to get a Return from the London Insurance Companies, and from other persons who have loaned

money on Irish land which has not been repaid, and that were laid on the Table, it would be seen that the money lent to the Irish landlords, and not repaid, probably amounts to very nearly the fee-simple value, at the present moment, of the entire soil of Ireland. So much for the theory of the right hon. Gentleman—that the line of political division of opinion corresponds to the line of demarcation between backwardness and progress. I would respectfully invite him, especially in these matters of practical legislation where precision is so important, not to found himself upon baseless theory notoriously at variance with the facts. If these two Ministers, the Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury, intended by their speech, and by their attack upon the majority of the Irish people and their elaborate praises of the minority, to convey that the proposals to be made before us in regard to Ireland would allow the majority to rule, their way of expressing that view is so exceedingly indirect that I may be pardoned for entertaining some doubt upon that point. If, on the other hand, the Prime Minister and the First Lord meant that they will not apply to Ireland the rule that they apply to England—that the minority in Ireland is to be fortified or protected, and that the majority is to be curbed and checked—then it would have been more frank to have advised the Sovereign not to tell the House that proposals would be made on the same general principles already adopted in Great Britain, but that the principles adopted here are opposed to those they intend to apply to Ireland. However, we shall very freely be able to judge of that as soon as we see the Bill; but, in the meantime, I think it necessary that a statement proceeding from so high an authority, and intended perhaps to have a covert bearing upon immediate legislation, should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Sir, in the Amendment which I now move I invite the House to inform the Sovereign that a decisive majority of the Irish people, and of their Representatives in this House, are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as her distinctive interests require, and that this conviction has been intensified by the manifest failure of the Land Purchase Act of 1891, to afford an acceptable basis for the

extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland. I do not endeavour in my Amendment to define precisely the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate well for Ireland, because I think it comprises more what physicians call a complication of disorders. It proceeds from profound ignorance of Ireland, an ignorance which I may as well say is incurable, because you are resolved not to take advice; and it proceeds partly from prejudice, which is certainly not upon the decrease among the Party opposite. That inability, also, in a great measure proceeds from the increasing strain and pressure of the duties of this Parliament, and that is a cause which will not diminish, but must increase, as time goes on. It will be observed that I do not invite from this House any declaration as to the right of Ireland to a separate Legislature. The judgment of Ireland upon that subject is quite enough for me; and the judgment of Ireland is undoubtedly that, even if your legislation for her interests were as good as it is bad; that circumstance would not affect her natural and historic right, which she is, under all circumstances, determined to maintain. I do not even ask you to declare upon the expediency of a separate Legislature for Ireland. That is a question for the electors of the country, which will presently come before them, and to them I am content to leave it. I do not raise any debate upon this occasion upon any specific scheme of Home Rule. I think the gallant Gentleman opposite must admit that it would be idle for me to do so in the presence of a trenchant majority which is firmly pledged to opposition to any and all Home Rule, and also committed by its own legislative act to the perpetual coercion of Ireland. It would be idle to raise discussion now; but the time for it will come very shortly, when the Minister vested with the power of conferring a Parliamentary Constitution upon Ireland proceeds to invite the House of Commons to execute the will of the country. I am not moved by the circumstance, of which I am well aware, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is athirst for particulars, and I know very well what he did with particulars when he had them before. He affected to accept the principle, but he used the particulars to attack the principle. He attacked the

principle from behind the particulars, and used the particulars both in this House and in the country as a means of procuring the defeat of the principle. The right hon. Gentleman's large family of plans of Home Rule all perished in their infancy. He frankly, I may say, cynically admits his failure in the capacity of a parent. Having failed in that capacity, he is now anxious to make a fresh start in life as a guardian of the progeny of others. But others are naturally unwilling to trust their progeny to him, as his antecedents, in their judgment, do not fit him for the office of guardian. His natural rôle—I speak with the greatest respect—is that of the wicked uncle. If I may illustrate by metaphor my view of the position of the right hon. Gentleman, I should say that he mutinied and deserted his ship because he was not suffered to take command. He has obtained another command, however, and is now captain of a band of political wreckers; but whenever or however he may regard that band, I tell him with some confidence that no Irish Nationalist will assist him in holding out false lights to the ship freighted with the hopes and fortunes of Ireland. I do not ask this House even to declare its own opinion upon its fitness to legislate well for Ireland, particularly because the Party opposite considers itself well able to legislate for the people of the whole world; while another reason is that this House is moribund. I regard it as a dying sinner, and I think it would be too cruel to ask a dying sinner to frame an epitaph commenting frankly upon his career; but it is not too much to expect that this House should make some atonement to those it has injured in the course of its ill-spent life; and I think I am entitled to ask it to make reparation for having placed Ireland under the ban of perpetual outlawry, by at least admitting the opinion which the Irish people hold upon the source of such legislation. I am asked the ground of the conviction entertained by the Irish people, that the Imperial Parliament is unable to legislate for Ireland, and I shall state it in brief and plain terms. For 90 years of what you call "Union"—the forced partnership between Great Britain and our country—we find that your population has trebled, and almost quadrupled, within that term, and has advanced—and I certainly do not

*Mr. Sexton*

grudge the advance—by leaps and bounds in the standard of the comfort of life, and in every element of national prosperity and individual wealth; whilst in the same period you have brought down our population, not only to the level at which it stood at the date of the legislative Union, but to the lowest level at which it stood within the century, and that population, so decimated by your policy, stands at this moment, generally speaking, upon a lower level of subsistence than anywhere prevails within the bounds of what claims to be civilised Europe. You may say that you are not responsible, but I say the responsibility is directly and solely yours; and why, because Ireland, being a country where the people had no means of living except by the cultivation of the land, where, therefore, it was necessary for them, from the first, to have legislative protection in the pursuit of their industry and in the security of the means of living—so far from affording that legislative protection, you did just the contrary. You placed over them, as I have said, a privileged class; you enabled that class to fix the price of the natural agent by the use of which the people could find a means of living; you placed in the hands of that class the power they have used without mercy and stint; and the result was that thrift was made impossible in Ireland, and that the verities of progress was rendered a mockery. The landlords were enabled and encouraged by your law, to take from the people all the produce of their labour, except so much as kept body and soul together, so that the formation of the first element of national prosperity, the capital fund or reserve in the hands of the people, was rendered impossible; and, therefore, we have seen, in the present day, tenant farmers in abject poverty, and we know that at present the labouring class is, by a necessary consequence of the condition of the farmer, the most wretched class, not only in the civilised world, but more wretched than some savage tribes. Well, Sir, the whole agrarian system is breaking down by its own weight, and I shall presently show that your attempt to substitute another system has proved abortive. But there is something more. Under the policy of legalised plunder that you have pursued in Ireland, you have never allowed us to come within

the Constitution. The time given to Ireland by the English Parliament since the Union, has been mostly passed in enacting coercive Statutes. There is an unbroken line of these Statutes, which extends from the date of the Union down to the present day, and this Parliament has capped the climax by passing what I must call an Act of perpetual outlawry, by a coercive Statute, which has placed Ireland under the ban of coercion, not for a day, but for all time. So that the nett result of the Union, which Pitt promised should bring us material prosperity, has been unexampled misery; and, politically, the result of bringing us into union with you has been, that you began by taking her native Constitution from Ireland, and you have finished in this Parliament by shutting out Ireland in perpetuity from the pale of the British Constitution. This is a brief sketch of the effect of your legislation for Ireland since the date of the Union; but I go on to say that I could found my Amendment and justify it on the effect of this Parliament alone. When you came into power in 1886 you were warned by the Irish Members, upon the amplest evidence, that the judicial rents in the Acts of 1881 would need, in that Session, to be revised, and that it was no longer possible to exclude leaseholders from the benefits of the Acts. Your reply was a *non possumus*. The fact that the demand was made upon you by Irish Members seemed a sufficient reason for refusal. You told us the judicial rents could not be touched, and that leasehold contracts could not be violated. Having enjoyed your satisfaction by refusing what the Irish Members then asked, in the very next year you brought in a Bill yourselves—a Bill halting, partial, and marred by great defects—but a Bill which did touch the sacred judicial rents, and broke the inviolability of the leases. You brought in that Bill when it pleased yourselves, and not when Ireland required it; and what was the effect of your Bill? In the interval, men, driven desperate by oppression, had recourse to the defence of agrarian combination, and you made the existence of that temporary combination the excuse, in the first place, for violating your pledge to the electors of Great Britain that you would not propose coercion, and, in the second place, for imposing coer-

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

cion, not for a time, but for ever. Four years passed, and last year, the old evil agrarian system having broken down, and being, by universal confession, a failure, you tried to substitute another; you set about passing the Land Purchase Bill; never had an English Minister a more splendid opportunity. The policy of purchase was generally accepted, the means in your hands were ample, your experience was sufficient, and the very machinery was ready; the country had a right to expect from you a great reforming Statute. But, unfortunately for Ireland, someone or other, possessed of a fatal love for ingenious complexity in financial affairs, was allowed to make that Act his hobby, and he rode it to death. The then Chief Secretary for Ireland anticipated a great success; he took the most elaborate precautions to provide that the large farmers should not run away with the share of the small ones; he fully expected, and avowed that expectation, that united Ireland would make a rush on that £30,000,000. The Marquis of Londonderry, in another place, got a clause inserted to provide that if the applications from the counties under the Act in any one year did not reach the common level of £1,200,000, an applicant of either class might come and take the balance. We remember the glowing terms in which the Act was heralded through Ireland, and in the Speech from the Throne at the end of last Session. Why is the Speech silent on the subject this year? The Tory Party is always ready to blow its own trumpet; why does not the right hon. Gentleman perform on that instrument with regard to the Act? There is what appears to me to be a conspiracy of silence. The Annual Report of the Irish Land Commission, which is usually distributed in December, has not yet been distributed for the year 1891, and the Monthly Reports of the proceedings of the Land Commission have been kept back since July last year, the month before the Land Purchase Act was passed. I think all this silence can only be explained by the fact that there is no pleasant story to tell. I have said that financial complexity ruined the Act, and there was no excuse for the blunder of the Government. They had the result of the working of the Ashbourne Act for five years before them when passing the Land Purchase Act, and at

that date, out of an amount of £400,000 repayable to the Treasury, the arrears only amounted to £600. Has the British Treasury ever come off so well with any other class of debtors? The Land Commission had only sold up 47 farms for default, and generally found process by a civil bill effective. During the whole of the stupendous transactions, extending over five years, not a penny has been lost to the State. The moral inference which the right hon. Gentleman might have drawn from all this was that the securities provided by the Ashbourne Act were sufficient—they were the security of the holding and the amount of the guarantee deposit. What did the right hon. Gentleman do in his Bill? He added four others—a reserve fund of £400,000, which Ireland was to provide; an insurance fund provided by the purchasing tenant; power to hypothecate £1,200,000 of the Imperial grant; and power to make a levy on the local rates to recoup the Imperial Exchequer. All this was superfluous. To my mind, however, the reserve fund would not have impeded contracts, nor would the power of hypothecation, which was unconstitutional; nor would the power to levy a county rate without the consent of the ratepayers, which was grossly and excessively unjust. These would not have prevented the practical working of the Act if individual landlords and individual tenants had seen that transactions under it would be to their advantage. The fatal blot on the whole Bill was the insurance fund. Before I come to that, however, I ought to say that the Act satisfies neither landlords nor tenants. Landlords decline it because they are unwilling to take Irish Land Stock instead of Consols, and as they are both National Stock it was a piece of financial pedantry to refuse them the taking of either. We begged the right hon. Gentleman to leave out the insurance clause, but he would not, and it was a fatal blot; because a land purchase system had been in operation for five years successfully in which there was no such fund. Since 1885 every purchaser under the Ashbourne Act has been allowed the full benefit of his bargain from the first; he was only asked to pay the State 4 per cent. on the purchase money, whatever that might be. Under the Ashbourne Act they had to wait a long time for the settlement on the

*Mr. Sexton*

judicial terms, but times have changed. The Irish people expect the return of a Liberal majority to power, and for a better administration of the Land Law; and looking to all these facts, was it reasonable, was it intelligent of the right hon. Gentleman to expect the farmers of Ireland to bind themselves, rather than wait three or four years, by a contract by which they and their successors would be bound for half a century, so that every man for the first five years would have to pay to the State for an insurance fund perhaps double as much as was paid in the first five years by his neighbour in the next parish who had purchased under the Ashbourne Act? The right hon. Gentleman knew little of Ireland, and next to nothing of human nature, if he expected anything of the kind. By insisting on the provision of an insurance fund he foredoomed his Act to failure. We told you so last year; you neglected our advice, and the result is before you. The legislative mountain has been in labour, and has brought forth, what? Not even a mouse. For, half a year ago, an Act was passed offering thirty millions to anyone who would come and ask for it, and the Secretary for Ireland has to-day told us that not £1 of Irish Land Stock had been sold. Not only do I judge the failure of the Act from the paucity of transactions, but from the national indifference. The landlords have discussed it only to damn it with faint praise, and it has been practically ignored on the part of the tenants. The Act which might have done a great, vigorous, and potential reform if it had been intelligently drawn, has fallen dead. In the space of nearly half a year the transactions, instead of reaching three-quarters of a million, as they would have done on the same lines as those under the Ashbourne Act, only amounted to £80,000, or to £130,000 to the end of January. We know the eagerness of the Irish landlords to escape from their present position; what must be their opinion of the Act when, out of 9,000 landlords, only 43 have applied under it, and out of half a million tenants only 175! Such failure is hopeless and absolute. Is it not a pitiable thing that in a House where you have the means of ascertaining the opinions of Irishmen who are well acquainted with their country, a measure of this kind, undoubtedly great in its conception and vast

in potentiality if wisely applied, should be doomed totally, because of the miserable attempt to impose unnecessary guarantees and an insurance fund which five years of experience had shown to be unnecessary? That fund was intended to meet a bad year, but the tenant would rather have gone on the security of his farm to meet it than be compelled by compulsory clauses to provide an insurance fund excessive from the first, and which would not benefit him till the end of his payments. No Irish Member, responsible to an Irish Assembly, dealing with this question would have thought of doing so, and ignoring the evicted tenants. After a night's Debate the right hon. Gentleman did insert a clause dealing with the question, but it has done more harm than good, as it discouraged and almost warned landlords not to deal with evicted tenants when their farms were relet. It did harm by fixing a limit of time absolutely inadequate. Why should the landlords and evicted tenants be forbidden to agree at any time if they wished to do so? It has tempted landlords to demand exorbitant prices by warning the tenant that unless he had signed an agreement by the fifth of this month his last chance of restoration was gone. The agreements, few as they, are likely to be abortive, as they will probably not be sanctioned by the Land Commission. I repeat the opinion I expressed last year, that this clause should be revived without the limit of time, and the landlords should be encouraged to deal with the evicted tenants whether the farms have been relet or not. If they cannot agree, the terms should be determined by the Land Commission or by arbitration. I deeply regret the failure of the Act, and in face of the evidence in my hands, of the public attitude in regard to the Act, and the contemptible number of these transactions, I think the right hon. Gentleman can hardly deny that the Act, as a means of substituting a new agrarian condition for that which has broken down of its own weight, has been a total failure. In my judgment, this Parliament has beaten the record, not only of blundering, but also of despotism, since the date of the Legislative Union. We have seen what has become of your great remedial measure. What has been done in the way of oppression? This Government found

Ireland a country in possession of a popular franchise and faithfully represented by a body of Members in this House. They were, nevertheless, guilty of the despotic folly, the amazing blunder, of placing Ireland outside the pale of the British Constitution by the unprecedented act of passing a Coercion Act unlimited by time. I can hardly believe that you imagine that in a country so maltreated, and represented in this House, you will be free for one Session or one month from the confusion and distraction in legislative affairs due to a discontented country. I think you have begun to understand that until you have set Ireland free to manage her own affairs you will never be free to manage yours, or to proceed with calmness and the necessary deliberation to even approach with the slightest prospect of decreasing the heavy arrears of the great and primary duties which lie in your hands as the legislative organ of this Empire. But the mandate of the Tory majority is exhausted, their power for evil or good is at an end. Moreover, the country has made up its mind, the turn of the country has almost come, and cumulative evidence leaves not the slightest doubt that the judgment of the great majority of the electors of Great Britain on the majority of this House, for their sins of omission and commission against the people of Ireland, is one of unqualified condemnation.

#### Amendment proposed.

At the end of the Question, to add the words, "We deem it our duty to acquaint Your Majesty that a decisive majority of the Irish people, and of their representatives in this House, are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as her distinctive interests require, and that this conviction has been intensified by the manifest failure of the Land Purchase Act of 1891 to afford an acceptable basis for the extension of the class of occupying proprietors in Ireland."—(Mr. Sexton.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

(5.25.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I have listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. Member who has just addressed the House, and I do not think he has, in any degree, specified the particular distinctive legislation which he thinks is necessary for Ireland, and which he thinks this House is unable to pass. He has, however, told us that he



does not think it necessary to define the inability under which he thinks the House is unable to legislate for Ireland. If he did, his definition lacked completeness, and certainly lacked preciseness. He has declined to specify the scheme of Home Rule which would satisfy the aspirations of Ireland. He has devoted the greater part of his speech to what he calls the failure of the Land Purchase Act of last year, and he relies entirely, apparently, upon the short experience that we have had of that Act up to the present. Surely, however, there are causes which it is not difficult to specify which may to a very large extent account for the small number of applications and the small amount of business done. The hon. Member led us to believe that, in his opinion, a comparison between the operations under the Act of 1885 showed that the transactions under that Act were very much more extensive than they had been under the Act of 1891. It is necessary for me to remind the House that the Act of 1885 made changes which were, at that time, certainly unexampled and without precedent. They offered to the tenants of Ireland opportunities and advantages which had never been offered before. The Act of 1885, for the first time, permitted the advance of the full amount of the purchase money. And I think the House will remember that the prediction was—and I am not sure that the hon. Member for West Belfast was not one of those who joined in the prediction—that the Act of 1885 would be a failure.

MR. T. M. HEALY: No, no.

MR. JACKSON: Well, I must say that I have seen quotations from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I think those quotations justify me in what I am saying. I think it would not be difficult to make quotations from the speeches of hon. Members opposite in regard to that Act for the purpose of showing that, in the opinion of hon. Members, it has successfully done its work, and that, by contrast with later Acts, it has been held to have been almost the perfection of legislation. There are, no doubt, other causes which have tended to some extent to delay the operations under the Act of 1891. Under that Act certain rules were prescribed, in the issue of which by the Treasury there was some delay, for which there was

*Mr. Jackson*

reasonable cause; and the absence of these rules may have to some extent tended to delay the working of this Act. The hon. Member has referred to the Insurance Fund principle as being fatal to the Act. That opinion is quoted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but so far from the Insurance Fund being a fatal blot, I believe it is a distinctly valuable feature. The hon. Member for Longford can scarcely have read the Act, or he would not have fallen into such an error; he would not have forgotten that the Insurance Fund is a fund provided for the tenant's own protection. It is a provision which the tenant is asked to make, so that in the event of certain possibilities taking place he may, at all events, be able to draw upon that fund and to provide for his difficulties; and so far from its being a blot upon the Act, I am inclined to regard it as a wise protection for the tenant, and for the Government. Another point to which the hon. Member for West Belfast referred as proof that the Land Purchase Act of last year had not been successful related to the fact that the landlords wished the Government to give them the option of taking Consols instead of Land Stock, and that was the real cause of the failure.

MR. SEXTON: No, no.

MR. JACKSON: I understood that was what the hon. Member meant, and I think he emphasised it that if that option were given them the Act would have been a success.

MR. SEXTON: No, no; I said nothing of the kind. I said that the difficulties of the landlords would have been diminished if this opportunity had been given.

MR. JACKSON: Well, I confess I am surprised. I think I may venture to say that no man paid greater attention to those Debates in the House during the passing of this Bill than did the hon. Member for West Belfast, and that he followed closely, day by day, every section and every line of the measure; but is it possible that the hon. Member has not read Section 15, and the sub-section relating to it, of that Act?

MR. SEXTON: It places upon the landlord engaged to sell that he should take the Land Stock in the first instance, and he cannot say what the value of that Land Stock would be, and it is upon the value of that Land Stock that the whole thing depends.

**MR. JACKSON:** I am sorry that I cannot appreciate the point of the hon. Member. The landlord in selling his estate has a certain guide and indication as to what would be the minimum price that he would get for his Land Stock. That minimum price is the price of Consols, and the Land Stock being at  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent., without the liability of reduction to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. after a certain period of time, is a better security than Consols, and has just as good a market as Consols, because it is exchangeable for Consols at any time.

**MR. T. M. HEALY:** Why does it not sell?

**MR. JACKSON:** The answer to that question is that the public are not yet familiar with it. I have no doubt whatever that so soon as the applications already received have been sanctioned, it will be found that there is a ready—a good market for any of the Land Stock which anybody could desire to sell. The hon. Member referred also to what he deemed to be one of the blots of the Act, namely, Section 13, which dealt with evicted tenants. I hope that whatever difficulties stood in the way in regard to this matter are being overcome. I am sure that every Member of the House desires to see that process hastened, and I am sure it is the desire of hon. Members not to interfere with it in the smallest extent. But I desire to put the House into possession of the real facts in regard to the comparative periods as to business transactions under this Act. I have referred to the inducements held out under the Act of 1885, and to what changes were made by that Act. I have taken out the actual business done in the period between September and January, 1891-2. In the first period there were 1,551 applications, representing £641,895. Of those applications 880 were connected with the Salters' Company Estates, and those 880 applications, representing £212,503, had been negotiated prior to the passing of the Act of 1885. When the prospect of the passing of the Act of 1885 came, these negotiations, I dare say, were delayed a little in order that they might take advantage of the Act of 1885. With regard to the second period there were 1,634 applications, representing £596,166; in other words, the business of land purchase in the two periods of time was practically the same.

It is the duty of Land Commissioners when they find the funds running down to give notice at a particular time that they will not sanction any more applications for the balance of what is called the "Ashbourne Money" unless those applications are founded on notice signed prior to a certain date. They gave that notice upon the 22nd August, and they fixed as the date the 26th August. More than £200,000 of notices have been received consequent upon the declaration, and of course, this has to some extent absorbed the demand on the market for the time being. But there is no proof in the figures I have given to show that the business of land purchase has slackened now, or has been slackened in the past six months more than it has been during the six months beginning with the Act of 1885. If that be true, it is too early to draw a conclusion that because the applications under the Act of 1891 have been comparatively few in the earlier months the Act of 1891 has been a failure; the demands have been supplied by the balance of the money which was available under the Ashbourne Act. I say that it is much too soon to draw any conclusion, and I deny altogether that the hon. Member for West Belfast has proved his case, that there has been a failure of the Land Act of 1891 as judged by any evidence that we have. It is too soon to determine that yet. The business of land purchase continues to proceed at about the same rate, and I have no doubt whatever that when the Land Commissioners are in a position to put in a clear and precise manner the operations of the Act of 1891, both buyer and seller will be in a better position to know what will happen from their transactions, and we may fairly look forward to a continued business in regard to land purchase. The hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, referred to certain matters which he thought proved the necessity of Home Rule. He told us that, in his opinion, one of the causes was the condition of the people of Ireland with regard to their poverty. Now the hon. Member proposes to remedy that poverty of Ireland by separating it from England—from the country that has given its credit for the purposes of Ireland. He

spoke with great fairness, and, I think, with great eloquence, of the position of England, which has advanced by leaps and bounds, and he has told us of a part of Ireland to which certain privileges were denied, but he did not tell us that there was a part of Ireland which possesses the wealth and intelligence of the country, and which, under the same laws, has made much progress. He did not tell us of a district of Ireland, of which I know something, which competes with our manufactures, and which successfully competes with us in everything it undertakes; and that most progressive portion of Ireland is not that part which demands separation from this country, and desires to be released from the control of the Imperial Parliament. No; they are the very people who believe that in the long run they will be benefited by being stout champions of that Union between Great Britain and Ireland which has existed so much for the benefit of both countries.

\*(5.55.) SIR GEORGE O. TREVELLYAN (Bridgeton, Glasgow): I think that no one who has sat opposite the right hon. Gentleman for the last five years will begrudge him the warm hearted cheers with which he was received upon his first speech as Irish Secretary. But I consider that the Member for West Belfast was justified in defending his proposals to-night solely upon the grounds of the Land Purchase Bill of last Session, and I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will never have a more difficult task than that which he has had to-night in replying to it, for it was a difficult task indeed. He gave statistics to the House that were absolutely of a phenomenal character; but what do these statistics mean? They mean that Parliament has spent its time in passing this measure of Land Purchase as a remedial measure for Ireland, but the fact of it is that instead of promoting the purchase of land in Ireland it has checked it, and checked it to a degree that is quite incredible. I approach the Purchase Act from a different point of view from the Member for West Belfast. He approved of the principle of the measure, and I was opposed to it. But I heartily agreed with him in this. I trusted that when the Bill was passed that it would be of benefit to Ireland in making

*Mr. Jackson*

a great number of peasant proprietors, and I believed and I trusted that it would tend to the reconciliation and pacification of Ireland, and in all the leading reforms in detail which the Member for West Belfast proposed in Committee I heartily agreed with him. It is precisely these points of detail on which we from this side of the House gave one class of advice and the Government adopted another class of advice—it is precisely these points of detail that have wrecked the Purchase Bill. I want to read to the House a few very significant figures indeed. In 1886 the estates that were sold were sold for 18 times the rent. In the year 1887 they were sold for 17·6 times the rent. In 1888 they were sold for 17 times the rent, and in 1889 they were sold for 16·4 times the rent; and in 1890 for 16·7 times the rent. And observe this: that all this while the average rents of Ireland had been going down on account of the operations of the Land Commission, and yet in five years the number of years' purchase had fallen from 18 times the rent to 16·7 times. Now, these significant figures have, in my mind, only one meaning, and that meaning is, that in the mind of the Irish tenant, which would be the mind of an Irish Parliament, the principle of the Land Act of 1881 still holds sway—the principle that the rent of Ireland should be subject to constant revision, and in the eyes of the tenant constant reduction. I think the argument I have given is a most practical one to see—constant reduction before you arrive at the real figure of the landlord's claim. Now, that is not the view of the Government—that was not the view of the Government. Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords spoke on this subject in the strongest words that a man can possibly use. He said—this was, I think, in August, 1886—

“We do not contemplate any reduction of the judicial rents. We do not think it would be honest in the first place, and we think it would be exceedingly inexpedient.”

The Government tried to adopt that policy, but they could not for two reasons: First, the pressure of the Irish Members; and, secondly, what was much more important, the pressure of the nature of the case. Mr. Parnell brought forward his proposal for revision for the purpose of reducing the rents. The

Government accepted that proposal in spite of what Lord Salisbury said. They accepted it a year too late. They did more; they extended the Act of 1881 to leaseholders, and it was only because they made that concession that even the Government with all their power were able to carry through this period of disturbance and discomfort in Ireland. Well, now, the Land Purchase Bill was brought in to destroy this system of dual ownership and revision of rents; but it has not destroyed the national way of regarding the question of the land. The figures which I have read to the House prove that the Irish tenant only uses the Land Purchase Bill for the purpose of completing and extending the work of the Land Courts and of reducing his rent. This is the position which I am anxious to prove—which I say these figures absolutely prove. What are the reductions which the Land Courts make? We have not got, I think, any Returns of reductions later than July, 1891.

MR. JACKSON: There are others.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: Oh, there are others. I have not been able to lay my hands on them. But in July, 1891, what was the statement? All through the whole of Ireland the rents had been reduced by the Land Courts from £20,000 to £16,000—that is to say, a reduction of 20 per cent.; but under the Land Purchase Act, when the tenant gives 16½ years' purchase, it is more than 30 per cent. reduction, and so it is quite evident that the tenants will only use the Purchase Act, if at all, for the purpose of reducing their rents more than they would be reduced by the Land Courts. That is the attraction which, under the Ashbourne Act, tempted so very many tenants to purchase. Now, I want to tell the House—and I think it is a very serious matter—what the result of the recent Purchase Act has been. During the operations of the Ashbourne Act the average number of applications was to the extent of £2,300,000 a year; that is to say, to the extent of about £200,000 a month. Since this Act has been passed, there has been the entire time only of the half year; instead of something like £1,150,000 being applied for, there has been only £75,000 applied for. But it is fairer to take it by the month, because there is a rise in the month of January. The best month—January—

since the present Purchase Act was passed has brought it up to £550,000 of applications, against this monthly sum of £200,000 that was applied for one year with another during all the four years that the Ashbourne Act was under operation. That is the most remarkable comparison of figures that I think has ever been known. Now, the reason of it is perfectly plain. I have shown that the reason the tenant applies under the Purchase Act is because he wants to have his rent reduced; but more than that, he wants to have an immediate reduction. But the right hon. Gentleman opposite, in his Purchase Bill, postpones to an almost indefinite time the opportunity of the tenant of having his rent reduced. He has to pay for five years only 20 per cent. less than his former rent, and what does that mean? Hon. Members must remember that he not only pays 80 per cent. on his rent, but he likewise pays, I think, on the average, 7 per cent., which was the share of his landlord's rates. And the consequence is, that the only immediate reduction—

MR. JACKSON: No, no.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: Does not pay that? How is that? Still he pays the rates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He does not pay the rates in addition to the 80 per cent.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: He pays the rates whatever they are; but I shall pass from that point for the present, and say it is 20 per cent. That is the reason, and the main reason, so far as I have been able to learn, that the tenants will not apply under the Act of 1891. But there are other reasons likewise. I have been informed, from more quarters than one, that one of the reasons that the Act of 1891 is unpopular is the very unfortunate amalgamation of the Commissioners of the Act of 1881 and the Act of 1885. Now, this amalgamation would be very inexpedient in any case, but it was undoubtedly inexpedient after the extremely strong remonstrances and representations that were made against it by the hon. Members who really speak the voice of the people of Ireland. Now, I have no doubt that the Government will say that this interference of the ordinary Land Commissioners has been postponed until the appeals have been worked off; and this is another point on which I should like some

information, and that is, how near the appeals are of being worked off, and how soon the Commissioners under the Act of 1881 will take part in the operations of the Purchase Act with the Commissioners of 1885? But the tenants know very little about that small point of whether or not these particular Commissioners have yet the power of determining values. What they know is that the general conduct of the affairs of purchase has been made to the whole Commissioners, and under Sub-section 6 the Land Purchase Act is administered by a majority of the Commissioners; that is, by those very Commissioners against whom the Members for Ireland on this side of the House, at any rate, unanimously protested as being Commissioners who had not the confidence of the Irish people. Then there is another point which weighs with me a good deal, and which I am quite satisfied must weigh with the tenants; that is, that the tenants are unwilling to purchase, because they do not know what obligations will be thrown upon them in the future. Hon. Members for England sometimes forget that there are many important burdens on the English rates, and on the English land, which do not lie upon the Irish land; and the most important of all these is education. In the country districts in England here a landlord pays largely for the education of the people, or it is paid out of the rates. Over at least three-fourths of Ireland the landlord pays nothing, or next to nothing, for the education of the people, and nothing whatever is paid out of the rates. But I suppose the House does not believe that if Ireland had the Parliament which is foreshadowed in this Amendment—that undoubtedly greater claims would not be made for education upon the districts in the shape of rates, and that all these would fall upon the tenant. And I think it is a very great blot indeed on this Purchase Act that the landlords are able to go off with the money in their pockets, with the prospect of the education rates, and other rates in the future, all capitalised so that they escape them, and so that in the future the burden would be laid upon the tenant, and the risk, will be on the British Treasury. For all these causes small proprietors are very shy of buying. The average value of an Irish farm in Ireland is £184 now. In the first

*Sir George Trevelyan*

15 months of the operation of the Ashbourne Act the average value of the holdings sold was not £184, but £450. In the next 15 months the average value went up to £460; and as I took down the figures of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, so far is the Act of 1891 from encouraging the small tenants to buy, that this very large average, already between twice and thrice the price of an average holding in Ireland, instead of falling has run up to nearly £500.

MR. JACKSON: No, not so much.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: I think that is very near the figure. It is too evident that this land purchase system has failed to establish small proprietors over the country hitherto, and that its action, instead of being quickened, has been very much diminished by the legislation of 1891. What your land purchase system has done is this: that certain great landlords—sometimes they are corporations—who were prepared to sell and had everything ready before the Ashbourne Act was introduced—sold directly, in the course of the first year, at 20 years' purchase. They got the benefit. But I imagine that after the first burst of selling very little has been done, and the pace is less quick than ever. Well, then, the land purchase system of the Government has failed to tranquillise the country. We earnestly trusted that it would put a stop to evictions. Now, it is not at the present moment the question of mere eviction; it is now a question of the more insidious eviction notices by which a tenant loses the *status* of part owner of his farm, and is put in the position of an ordinary individual, with no hold on the farm. The purchase system of the Government came into full operation in 1888. In that year there were 9,700 eviction notices served, in the next year there were 6,500, in the next year there were 5,932, and in the first half of 1891 there were 2,258. I say, when you have an average of 5,000 eviction notices in one year, it is a very poor result of the immense sacrifices which were made by the British people in granting this purchase system to Ireland, and the great obligations which Ireland has incurred. Now, Sir, I want to say two or three words about the general character of this Amendment. I can quite under-

land that there are a good many Members in this House who do not wish to see this Amendment placed on the journals of this House. Can they for a moment deny any single word that is contained in it? What is it?—

“We deem it our duty to acquaint Her Majesty that a decisive majority of the Irish people and of their Representatives in this House are convinced of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as its distinctive interests require.”

Are we not so convinced? In 1885 over three-fourths of the Irish population—over, I should say, five-sixths or seven-twelfths of the area—there were contests on this question, and that part of Ireland declared quite unanimously, by an absolutely phenomenal majority, in favour of this question. In 1886 there was another General Election. There were no contests, but the same results occurred. Since then there have been contests, and very hot contests indeed. But it is observable that every Member who came into Parliament successfully on either side—if I may so express it—in these contests was in favour of the theory that this Parliament could not properly legislate for Ireland. At Cork the population has increased very substantially since 1885, but the number of citizens of Cork who were opposed to the declaration made in this Amendment fell off at the last Election from 1,500 to 1,100. What have hon. Gentlemen to say against the only conclusion we can draw? In the first place, they say it is a question of clerical influence. At the election of Sligo the candidate whom the Ecclesiastical Party supported succeeded; at the election of Waterford the candidate whom the Ecclesiastical Party opposed succeeded; and they both were in favour of this Amendment. It is quite idle to use the clerical argument against this declaration of Irish Nationalist feeling. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, with great assurance, said there was a province in Ireland which stood aloof from this way of regarding Ireland.

MR. JACKSON: A part of Ireland.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: Well, what is that part of Ireland? This body of opinion is entirely confined to three or four counties, and does not even exist outside them in such force as to be able to return a Member of Parliament. You may fairly say that the part of Ireland to which the right hon.

Gentleman refers touches the shores of a single lake, and yet on that lake there are counties, where there is a numerous Nationalist tinge amongst the people—counties where it is very doubtful whether there is not a Nationalist majority. The Prime Minister tells us that the minority are rich, and that the poor and needy are the majority; and he gives two instances of cities in support of this, and one of these cities returns one of the most respectable and influential Nationalists in this House; and, therefore, I say that it is quite worth while putting the hon. Member for West Belfast's Amendment on the Paper in order to teach the Prime Minister a lesson in political geography. There is another theory, which is the one held apparently by the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Londonderry. He says the cry is factitious, and is got up by demagogues. When Lord Londonderry came back to our part of the country in the North of England he was treated with great ovations, and a great banquet was given in his honour. This is what he said on the subject—I am not sure, by the way, whether these words were spoken in England or at Belfast—but they are his words. He said, “This demand for a Parliament in Dublin comes solely from a body of men,” whom he then describes—and I shall not insult the Irish Members of Parliament by reading the description then given of them by a man who was sent to Ireland to be their ruler. Now, I maintain that the manner of this speech of Lord Londonderry is a tremendous argument in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman—the mere fact that the ruler of Ireland should speak in this way of the chosen Representatives of the country that he ruled—in a way that I will not read. (Cries of “Read it!”) Well, I will read it if it so wished—

“Whence comes this demand for a Parliament in Dublin? It comes solely from a body of men whose leaders have no stake in the country, who have contributed nothing to the wealth of the country, who have nothing to lose and everything to gain, who trust that in the change they clamour for they will share in the benefits arising from the enterprise of others, which they themselves have no part or lot in, and divide the spoils which they never helped to win.”

It is a sufficient reason for this Amendment that Ireland is governed by rulers

who thus speak of the chosen representatives of her people. But it is to the matter, and not the tone, that I now object. It is not a question of demagogues in Ireland. Anyone who has had to do with the administration of Ireland knows that the national feeling is not a slight feeling, that it is not a superficial feeling—that it is a genuine irrepressible feeling, an immutable feeling in the population; that it does not depend on the land question, that it does not depend on clerical influence, and that it depends still less upon the exhortations, however eloquent, however sincere, of any public man, to whatever section of the Irish Party he may belong. Before I sit down, I will accept the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. That challenge—for I took down the words—was to bring forward a distinctive instance of the inability of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland as her interests require. I cannot even conceive how anyone can have lived through this Parliament and have the very slightest doubt that the case, in the exact words of the right hon. Gentleman, has been absolutely made out. Each Session Bills are brought into Parliament—Bills of the very greatest importance to Ireland—Bills as to which there is no difference at all amongst five-sixths or nine-tenths of the people of Ireland. Each Session these Bills come to nothing, and that for three causes—first, that they are opposed by the majority of the Members of this House; next, that they cannot pass through another House—where not one single Nationalist sits; and, thirdly, and this is almost as important as the other two, there is no time for them. What do hon. Gentlemen say to this? At this moment, except, I think, in two municipal towns, an enormous majority of the Irish residents and citizens in the boroughs are deprived of taking any part in the municipal life of their country.

MR. T. M. HEALY: One.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: I thought it was two. What do hon. Gentlemen say to this? Irish registration is still ineffective, and many points on which Irish Members feel most keenly cannot be amended, because in old days the House of Lords—now I am sorry to say a majority in the House of Commons—was set against them. What do

*Sir George Trevelyan*

hon. Gentlemen say to the question of the boundaries of Dublin? I do not say whether it is right or not, but I have no doubt almost all Irishmen, especially all Dublin men, want to enlarge the boundaries of Dublin. Have hon. Gentlemen read the paper put into their hands this morning—the census of Leinster? Have they seen how the city of Dublin is diminished in population; how, on the other hand, there has been a very large increase in those suburban districts where rich men live? But the Dublin citizens cannot increase the boundaries of their city because Imperial Parliament has no time for it, and if it has time, has not the will. Again, the Corporation of Dublin, even the House of Commons, were unanimous in favour of doing away with the most humiliating, and most inefficient, and I think in some degree, the most cumbrous system of conducting the finances of the city. Yet though the Corporation of Dublin and the House of Commons were in favour of it, the Committee of the House of Lords, at the instance of a paid official of the Corporation of Dublin—paid by the Corporation of Dublin, but not responsible to the Corporation of Dublin—at his instance a Committee of the House of Lords (five Lords sitting in conclave) were able to defeat what is the overwhelming opinion, perhaps almost unanimous, of those who live in the capital of Ireland. No, Sir, none of Ireland's wishes can be met unless it suits the views of that minority in Ireland which has the ear of the majority in this House, and of almost the entire complement of the Members of the other House. Ireland is not unavenged. I shall vote for this Amendment, as hon. Members last year voted for the Irish Purchase Bill and voted for Free Education in England, because I am convinced, just as they were, of the need for a change in our policy. I shall vote for this Amendment as a British Member of the House of Commons, and still more as a Scottish Member. While Irish grievances are being ventilated, while Bills which Irishmen approve in principle are being passed through Committee, while details which Irishmen recommended are accepted grudgingly or are rejected—in all cases with immense expenditure of time—still more while Coercion Bills, which Irishmen hate, are being thrust down their throats.

lome cries of "Oh, oh!" and laughter.)  
 —To laugh is not to answer, nor is it  
 annerly—I say while these things are  
 eing done English, Scottish, and Welsh  
 usiness is thrown into a corner. All  
 ast Session Wales got nothing except  
 Tithes Bill, which it did not  
 want. The crofter districts of Scot-  
 land, about half the area of Scotland,  
 wish to get certain legislation. Part of  
 it this Parliament approved of in prin-  
 ciple, against other parts of it there is  
 really nothing to be said. These districts  
 can get nothing, largely because Ireland  
 blocks the way. When we take the  
 whole of Scotland what do we find?  
 The majority, and indeed the whole of  
 Parliament, voted in favour of entirely  
 reforming the system of Parochial  
 Boards—a matter equally as important  
 to Scotland as District Councils in  
 England. Nine years have passed, and  
 Scotchmen—on a matter which they under-  
 stand, on a matter on which they are as  
 good as unanimous—cannot have their  
 way because business is so blocked.  
 English, Welsh, and Scottish measures  
 are waiting by the dozen and by the  
 score, and they will have to wait until  
 Irishmen can do Irish business on the  
 soil of Ireland according to Irish ideas.  
 Sir, I think it is high time that there  
 was an end to this system of mutual  
 hindrance between communities who  
 could carry on their own affairs much  
 better and much quicker if they were  
 allowed to carry on that part of their  
 affairs which concerns themselves, and  
 which can be managed without detriment  
 to others. Therefore it is, that out of  
 goodwill to Ireland, and because till this  
 question is settled the rest of the  
 nation cannot have the arrears of legis-  
 lation for which they have been so long  
 waiting, I shall most cordially support  
 the doctrine laid down in the Amend-  
 ment.

(640.) MR. DUNBAR PLUNKET  
 BARTON (Armagh, Mid): I trust  
 the House of Commons will be lenient  
 to a new Member. I see very little  
 about the speech of the right hon.  
 Gentleman, who has just sat down, to  
 reply to. It seems, however, to be the  
 fashion now to attack absent Peers.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: I beg  
 he hon. Member's pardon. I spoke of  
 ord Londonderry, not as a Peer, but as  
 an ex-Viceroy of Ireland.

MR. BARTON: I reply to the right  
 hon. Gentleman as an ex-Chief Secretary  
 for Ireland. No more insulting language  
 has been used by Lord Salisbury or by Lord  
 Londonderry, or any other Peer, than  
 that of the right hon. Gentleman him-  
 self, which we, as Unionists, well remem-  
 ber. He said "there were two Irelands—  
 the Ireland of loyalty, and the Ireland that  
 sympathised with crime." I would not ven-  
 ture to rise to-night, but my constituents  
 are deeply interested in the two subjects  
 with which this Amendment deals,  
 namely, with the capacity of this Parlia-  
 ment to legislate for Ireland and with  
 the Land Purchase Policy. My con-  
 stituents, Sir, are strongly in favour of  
 land purchase, and I heartily sympathise  
 with them. Many of them wish to see  
 land purchase universal, and I am not  
 afraid to say that if that could be carried  
 out with the concurrence of the Treasury,  
 and with the concurrence of the landlords  
 and tenants of Ireland, I would be in  
 favour of universal land purchase. But,  
 Sir, my constituents, who are mainly  
 tenant-farmers, and who are themselves  
 enthusiastic about land purchase, are not  
 so impatient as to condemn an Act of  
 Parliament because it does not boom  
 in six months. They are not so  
 ingenuous as to suppose that they ever  
 would get a Purchase Bill from the hon.  
 Member for West Belfast as Chan-  
 cellor of Exchequer of an Irish  
 Parliament, and they are wise enough to  
 know that the Purchase Act of last  
 Session was a large, a liberal, and a very  
 carefully considered step towards the  
 ultimate reaching of their aspirations.  
 We are in Ulster in favour of land pur-  
 chase, because we believe that if we can  
 make a large majority, and, if possible,  
 all of the occupiers of Ireland, owners of  
 their farms, you will make Ireland easier  
 to govern, and you will make Ireland  
 more difficult for hon. Members opposite  
 to agitate in. The Ulster tenant farmers  
 who returned me here six weeks ago have  
 given a denial to this Amendment.  
 Though they like land purchase they  
 have been convinced in the last five years  
 that this country is capable of governing  
 Ireland. For the rest of Ireland my test  
 is found in the speeches of hon. Members  
 opposed during the Recess—speeches made  
 to their constituents, and speeches which  
 are directly inconsistent with the Amend-  
 ment which they now offer. What is  
 the Amendment? It asks the House to



adopt three propositions—first, that the Act is a failure. With reference to that we have had very reassuring statements from the Chief Secretary. The hon. Member has said what will surprise most Irish landlords, that this Stock could not fall below the price of Consols. That statement is most reassuring, and it will certainly have a very important effect upon this Act. The hon. Member also told us other matters which were very reassuring—that all the money is not applied for and is not all dealt with. You cannot expect the Irish tenants to commence their dinner before digesting their lunch. Secondly, it is said that the failure of this Bill is because of its defects. It is because of that statement that I call in question the speech of the hon. Member. The hon. Member for Longford, who can speak with authority as a lawyer, as he is familiar with the Bill as a lawyer, but also with authority as a Member, addressing his constituents, said in Longford, when dealing with the Insurance Fund, which we are told is to be the final proof of the incompetence of this House to deal with Irish matters, that 20 per cent. is the biggest reduction under the Balfour Act; but if this Amendment is right the Act has failed because this Parliament is incompetent. What did the hon. Member for Longford say? He said the reason was because there was a section, 33 strong, led by Parnell, who said that it was a grand Act, and they could not amend it in the House of Commons. So that the reason of the Insurance Fund failing is not because of the incompetence of the House, but because of the split in the hon. Member's own Party. The moral of that argument is that his own Party should be united, and not that this Parliament should be broken up. What did the hon. Member say within the last few weeks when, in addressing a meeting, he referred to the various defects of the Act? Did he tell his audience that the reason of the failure of the Act was that Parliament was unfit to govern Ireland? No. If it has failed it is not due to the incompetence of Parliament, but to his own Party. If that is the reason of the defect, why has it failed in Ireland? I now turn to the hon. Member for East Mayo. I think he can provide the answer. The hon. Member for East Mayo did not allow the grass to grow

*Mr. Barton*

under his feet. Before this Act was passed, he told the tenants what was his advice. Speaking at Wexford, when delegates from every district assembled, addressing the tenant farmers, a Member of this House who claims, and rightly claims, to be influential in Ireland—on whose speeches are read all over Ireland, says—

"That the first question which suggests itself to my consideration is that the tenant farmers ought not to avail themselves of the Land Act."

There is the question put very clearly, but it is not more clearly put than answered. He says, my advice is simple and distinct. Have nothing whatever to say to the new Purchase Act. Add that to the reason that we are told this Bill has failed because Parliament is incapable. I say that speech alone would account for the failure of this Act. What reason does the hon. Member give? Does he give the reason that this Act is a bad Act? He gave a reason why they should not buy. His words were:—

"Now my advice to the farmers of Ireland is simple and distinct, and it is this: have nothing whatever to say to the new Purchase Act. (Cheers.) The ranks of the people of Ireland are re-forming. The National movement is rising again to its full former strength after the troubles of last winter. (Cheers.) We have shown in the past that by organisation and by perseverance we have been able to get each succeeding year better and better terms, so that those tenants who settled and bought ten years ago are sorry to-day, some of them, for having done so. The darkest days are over. (Cheers.)"

On the face of that statement to the farmers of Ireland, I suppose the hon. Member will walk into the Lobby to ask the House to affirm that the failure of the Act is due, not to his advice, and the reasons he gave to the people of Ireland, but to the absurd, ridiculous view which he has expressed on this Amendment. I am not the only person who has put this construction upon his words. The hon. Member for Waterford, speaking in County Kildare on this matter, referred to the Land Act as a valuable Bill for the farmers of Ireland, and he referred to the reasons why it failed. He said:—

"That Bill, as you will remember, last Session was first attacked and opposed by the leading Members of the Seceders, and it was only when Mr. Parnell went into the House of Commons, and showed that that Bill would be an enormous benefit to the farmers of Ireland

that they desisted from further opposition. Even then they hung on the flank of the Bill, and though they did not openly destroy it, they did their best to impair it."

I am against the insurance fund. I would like to see this Bill even a much larger Bill than it is. But for the first time in the history of legislation it has been said that because an Act requires amendment—I think it requires amendment—not that the amendment should be effected, but that this Parliament should be broken up. The hon. Member for East Mayo answered the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford by a long letter in the papers, but he never referred to the taunt, nor thought it worth his while to deny it. On the 7th February Mr. Davitt, who was chosen as the representative of hon. Gentlemen opposite, said in Kildare:—

"All I have got to say on this point is this: If the tenant farmers will put this Act in operation at the present time they will regret it."

Can hon. Members wonder that the Act has fallen dead? It has fallen dead by the words of the very men who blamed the incompetence of this Parliament to deal with Irish questions. Before sitting down I would say one word as representing the tenant farmers in Ulster. We are told that there are none but Irish landlords represented by Irish Members on this side of the House. I believe I have nearly 5,000 supporters, but hon. Gentlemen opposite did not give me the opportunity of testing how many. Among these I am not aware, I think, of more than five landlords. I do not represent the landlords, I represent the commercial, industrial, and, especially, the agricultural classes. On their behalf I say I object to the way in which the hon. Member for North Belfast, following the example of the right hon. Member for Derby, has tried to raise the cry of religious bigotry. It is from the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, and not from these Benches, that the cry of bigotry has been raised.

MR. SEXTON: I condemned raising the cry of religious bigotry.

MR. DUNBAR BARTON: It has been said that the government of Ireland is carried on for the benefit of those we represent. I would like to test that charge by the measures of the last and the preceding Session. What were these measures? They were for the relief of

the people of Ireland. We rejoiced that they applied to the constituents of hon. Gentlemen opposite. When the right hon. Gentleman, now the Leader of the House, nobly conceived and carried out that work of charity, not one penny went to the people I now represent. The Bill for light railways and tramways did not benefit our constituents, but those represented by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Even this Purchase Act which they are now attacking we do not think was adapted to Ulster, but far more to the farmers of the West of Ireland. If I had to protest for a grievance it would be on behalf of the farmers of Ulster, that land legislation ought to be framed more to suit their grievances. Hon. Members laugh. We have our grievances in Ulster, but we expect to see them remedied by this Parliament, and this Parliament alone; and we are grateful to the Government for the measures they have passed during this Parliament for relieving the distress of their Catholic subjects. We are grateful to them, above all, for restoring to Ireland order and settled government, and showing by the policy they have pursued that England is capable, and has never been incapable, of, in this Parliament, meeting the wants, redressing the grievances, and governing the people of Ireland.

(7.5.) MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): In congratulating the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down upon his speech, I may say that we heard with great satisfaction his declaration that he had been convinced by the speech of the hon. Member for West Belfast, if not convinced before, that the Land Purchase Act of last Session is defective, and when in the course of a few days we endeavour to remedy those defects we hope we shall have the assistance of the hon. and learned Gentleman. Sir, the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Belfast raises two distinct points. Each one would have been sufficient to engage the serious attention of the House. So far as the smaller or more restricted of the two questions is concerned—namely, that dealing with the Land Purchase Act—I desire to say that I heartily sympathise with the arguments used by the hon. Member for West Belfast, in which he pointed out the defects which have led to the failure of the Act up to the present..

It is conceded by all who know anything of the matter that this Insurance Fund—to which the hon. and learned Gentleman has declared his hostility—is the main defect which stands in the way of the tenant farmers of Ireland taking advantage of the Act. That Insurance Fund had not the support, so far as I know, of any section of Irish Nationalists in this House; it certainly was opposed by the late Mr. Parnell and by those who were honoured in following his lead; it certainly was opposed by us, and it was inserted in the Bill undoubtedly to cater to English public opinion and to provide another safeguard for the money of the British taxpayer. Another defect in the Bill which the hon. Member for West Belfast most rightly alluded to was the failure of Clause 13 to provide any assistance to the evicted tenants in Ireland. Sir, I listened to the speech of the hon. Member for West Belfast with attention and interest, because a Bill has been introduced by the hon. Member for Roscommon dealing with that defect in the Bill of 1891 in almost the very manner recommended by the hon. Gentleman. I sympathise with the position taken up by the hon. Member for West Belfast, but I do not go the full length of his Amendment. I do not think he established his case for saying that the Land Purchase Act of 1891 was a manifest failure to provide an acceptable basis for the establishment of a peasant proprietary. My opinion is that it does afford a basis, and a valuable basis. There are defects in the machinery which prevent it from working, but the machinery is there, and the defects can be removed, and when that is done an enormous boon to the tenant farmers of Ireland will result. Therefore, while joining with the hon. Member in calling attention to these defects, and calling for their removal, and showing that these defects were not due to the Nationalist Party, but were put in to satisfy English opinion, I am not prepared to deny, as this Amendment denies, that the Act forms a valuable basis for the creation of a peasant proprietary. The other portion of the Amendment seems to me to raise questions of the widest interest and the greatest importance. For my part I regret that the hon. Member did not see fit to introduce a little more appearance of reality into this portion of the

*Mr. John Redmond*

Amendment. I was oppressed all through with a feeling I could not conquer that there was an utter absence of reality in the observations he made on that part of his case. Sir, a debate has been raised in this last Session of Parliament on the subject of Home Rule in a somewhat half-hearted or faint-hearted fashion. But I believe that no Debate on this question of Home Rule for Ireland ought to be allowed to terminate without the voice and opinion of all sections of the Irish people, and the requirements of the moment being clearly and unmistakably heard in this House. There is no use in disguising the fact that at this moment amongst large masses of the Irish people there exists the very gravest anxiety on this question. There is, among large masses, a wide-spread desire for some further information—not for the details of the measure which the Liberal Party have promised to introduce—that is a cry that we have never raised; that is a foolish and impossible demand. No, not for information as to the details of the Home Rule Bill, but for information with reference to certain of its main features and proposals. We know from the speech delivered a few days ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, we know for the first time officially, that it will be proposed to keep the Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament, but as to the consequences likely to flow from that change in the Home Rule Bill of 1886, and especially how far the Imperial Parliament is to retain the power of interfering with and controlling Irish legislation, we know absolutely nothing. Not only do we know nothing, but we hear contradictory voices. I believe that the Irish people have real and substantial ground for the anxiety which they feel. We are told we should simply trust to the admitted, recognised and honoured earnestness of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. We are told we should trust implicitly to his good intentions and the good intentions of his Party, that we should not embarrass our friends. Sir, in asking for information, I deny that I am taking a course which will embarrass the Liberal Party in the future. They have succeeded in bringing over to Home Rule the great majority of the people of England, who are convinced that in

order to carry out the pacification of Ireland it will be necessary to grant Home Rule with a large and a generous hand. That being so, how can it be an embarrassment to the Liberal leaders and their party to declare the main features upon which they intend to shape their Home Rule policy. Sooner or later these main features will have to be discussed in the constituencies, and if these main features were voted upon by the constituents the House of Lords would not dare for one instant to stand between Ireland and that Home Rule which the English electors want. In asking for information I am taking the most direct course to hasten the progress of Home Rule. Much has happened within the last year in Irish politics. I do not care to refer to all the circumstances which have undoubtedly shaken the faith and confidence of a certain section of the Irish people in this matter. The policy of patience, silence and confidence, which might have been safe when Ireland had a united Nationalist representation and a wise and powerful leader, is, as many of us know, both unsafe and unwise in the present circumstances of political life. Every event of the past year in our opinion has only tended to increase the anxiety of those who are doubtful in Ireland on this question. In December, 1890, a demand for further information was made upon the Liberal leaders, not by a section of the Irish Nationalists, but by the united Irish representation. In view of the differences of opinion arising between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell on the accuracy of Mr. Parnell's recollection, the Whips were instructed to obtain from Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, and Sir William Harcourt, before further consideration of the question, what their views were with respect to these two vital points—the control of the police and the land question. Two days later another Resolution was passed in these terms :—

“That the following members of the Party, namely, Mr. Leamy, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. T. M. Healy, are hereby authorized to request a conference with Mr. Gladstone for the purpose of representing the views of this Party, and requesting an intimation of the intention of himself and his colleagues with respect to certain details connected with the following subjects :—

1. The settlement of the Irish Land Question.

2. The control of the Irish Constabulary in the event of the establishment of an Irish Legislature.”

Therefore, Sir, so far back as December, 1890, the necessity for obtaining further information was admitted by the Irish Nationalist Party. We used all the arts of persuasion, and I may add entreaty, to carry out the object with which we went to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, but we made our appeal in vain. What the Irish people have been asking ever since is, Why the information was refused. There was a terrible and cruel situation for Ireland at that moment, which threatened us with months, and perhaps years, of internal discord, and we were all of opinion that, if the desired information were given, that situation could be ended and that discord stopped. Though that was our opinion the information was denied. After an interval of some weeks the United Nationalist Party again endeavoured to obtain the information which was desired from the Liberal leaders. The same considerations were pressed—the necessities of the general situation, and the necessities of the particular situation that existed at that moment—and again that information was refused. It was suggested that the information might be given secretly, so that no embarrassment might be felt by the right hon. Gentleman. But secret as well as public information was refused. These two refusals under these extreme circumstances of pressure, naturally as I think, had the effect of arousing anxiety, doubt, and misgiving in the hearts and minds of Irishmen. But I come to the gravest case of anxiety of all. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby began to make speeches in England. Almost the very first of his utterances on the Irish situation was an utterance in which he stated that, while the English people were still firm in their allegiance to Home Rule, and the Liberal Party still prepared to grant it, neither he nor his colleagues nor the Liberal Party nor the English people were in favour of what is called Mr. Parnell's Fenian Home Rule. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did he refer to? What was Mr. Parnell's Fenian Home Rule? Was it not then what it had always been—not the demand of Mr. Parnell, but of the entire Irish people; and, finally, I will ask, Was it Fenian

Home Rule? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham made a speech the other night in which he displayed his usual hostility and malignity to Ireland. He made a speech, not for the purpose of doing anything great or noble, but with the view of making a little mischief, and, in furtherance of his policy, he had the hardihood to misquote the words of the late Mr. Parnell. He professed to quote Mr. Parnell's definition of Home Rule. I will read the whole passage, and I think I have reason to complain that the right hon. Gentleman did not read one sentence more, because that sentence more might tell against his argument. Here is the whole passage. It was made in a speech on 25th January, 1891:—

"The Liberal Party and Mr. Gladstone know what Ireland wants. There can be no mistake about it. We want a Parliament with full powers to manage the affairs of Ireland—this is the part that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham carefully omitted, and across which he drew his pen:—

"without trenching on any Imperial prerogative or injuring any Imperial or English interest: but a Parliament we must have that will be supreme in regard to Irish questions."

It may be said that that was an uncorrected speech, but I have a report of a Convention held in July last, over which Mr. Parnell presided, and which defined the Nationalist programme to be the restitution to the Irish people of the right to manage their own affairs in a Parliament elected by the people of Ireland. Is that what the right hon. Member for Derby is speaking of when he talks of Mr. Parnell's Home Rule? It is the Home Rule supported by every man who sits on this side of the House. There is not an Irish politician who will take that programme in his hand and say he will accept one whit less as a satisfactory solution. If that is what he refers to, he is wrong in calling it Parnell's Home Rule Bill. It is the Home Rule of O'Brien and Dillon and McCarthy, and I say it is monstrous on the part of the right hon. Member for Derby to pretend that it is a Fenian Home Rule scheme. I also deny that the scheme has any connection with Separation. We are a Constitutional Party seeking, within the Constitution, to obtain the restitution of the Irish Parliament. We are not Separatists, and those whom I repre-

*Mr. John Redmond*

sent are willing to accept the scheme which I have read as final and conclusive. A great deal of nonsense, it seems to me, has been spoken on both sides of this question about the words "supremacy of Parliament," "a subordinate Parliament," "a co-ordinate Parliament." I will explain what I understand by these phrases. This Imperial Parliament is supreme. None of us desires to touch its supremacy, and it must remain to the end of all things the supreme Imperial Parliament. I would be inclined to repeat the argument which, I am sorry to say, was used without effect in the pre-Union Debates in Ireland, when it was urged by the great constitutional lawyers that the Irish Parliament had no power to abdicate its own functions; so I would say you have no power to destroy the supremacy of your Imperial Parliament; at any rate, we have no desire to interfere with it. We belong to this Empire, and the symbol of our right to take part in the Government of that Empire will be found in the continued presence of the Irish Members here. We are willing to come here to take part in the government of that Empire, which owes its existence quite as much to the intellect and energy of Irishmen as to the intellect and energy of Scotchmen and Englishmen. Under these circumstances, it is an absurdity to suggest that we desire to interfere, in the remotest degree, with the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. While we object to the words "subordinate Parliament," we do not object to such a phrase as a "minor Parliament," because a Parliament created under this, for Ireland, must always be a minor Parliament. But I and others gather, from the constant repetition of the phrase, that what is desired and intended by some people is, that after you have given us the right in an Irish Legislature, to deal with Irish affairs, then you are to have the right of constituting yourselves a Court of Appeal, wherein every Act passed by the Irish Parliament would be brought up and re-considered, and interfered with, and destroyed. That is a danger we foresee. It may be said that there exists a veto with reference to Colonial Legislatures, and undoubtedly in theory that is the case; but everybody knows that the exercise of that power is a dead letter. The colonies are not represented here. They are at the other side of the world, and

it would be preposterous and ridiculous for this Parliament to endeavour to revise and control Acts passed by them. You are going to keep the Irish Members here—I do not know in what numbers—but in that case you will have here representatives of the small body which is working against Home Rule, and would have them trying to wreck Home Rule by raising Debates, and the result would be that the Irish Parliament would have every Act and word criticised and interfered with in this Parliament. I have no hesitation in saying that no Legislature that the wit of man could devise could possibly exist if all its transactions were to be made the subject of discussion and amendment and control by a Court of Appeal in the shape of Imperial Parliament. While, therefore, we admit that this Parliament must remain supreme in Imperial matters, we demand that in those Irish matters which are to be committed to the Government of the Irish Parliament, that Irish Parliament shall be supreme. I do not know what the views of the right hon. Member for Derby are in this matter, and the Irish people are in doubt and mystery on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Liberal Party and the English people will not have Mr. Parnell's Fenian Home Rule. We know that Mr. Parnell's Home Rule is the demand of the whole Irish people, and they want to know whether the Member for Derby means—I do not believe that he does—that the Liberal Party will not accept such a scheme of Home Rule as Mr. Parnell propounded. The right hon. Gentleman makes us fear that the Liberal Party may be tempted to destroy the chance of Home Rule by some attempt to disregard Irish opinion, and therefore it is that we ask for some general declaration of policy. I do not believe in the wisdom of the Irish people or the Liberal Party living in a fool's paradise. We ought to know what is in one another's minds. I am not alone in making this demand. There are Members of the Liberal Party who have made it. The hon. and learned Member for Fife has made exactly the same demand, and for the same reasons which have given. There is another, and possibly a more powerful, ground on which I base this demand for information. The right hon. Member for Derby some little time ago delivered a speech

VOL. I.

[1 SERIES.]

in the City of Glasgow which created considerable uneasiness in Ireland; and just as it was beginning to disappear, that bad impression was revived in a startling manner by a speech made by the right hon. Gentleman who has taken part in this Debate to-night. Lord Salisbury had stated that the House of Lords had the power and was prepared to exercise it—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer confirmed the statement—offeremptorily throwing out a Home Rule Bill, if its main provisions had not been voted upon at the General Election. On the 8th October in Glasgow the right hon. Member for Derby said, speaking of the House of Lords—

“They hope to wear us out by dissolution forced on us by the House of Lords. Well, I fancy they will find themselves mistaken. In my opinion, if they are going to play that game they should have rope enough; they should be allowed to do their worst on the whole scope and tenour of Liberal reforms; to make clear to the nation their attitude towards the popular will on all the heads of popular reform and upon all its measures.”

We read that in Ireland as meaning that if the Home Rule passed by the House of Commons were rejected by the House of Lords, it would be hung up while the House of Commons proceeded to discuss the items of the Newcastle programme. The Liberal Party would pursue the even tenour of its way, and Ireland be left out in the cold, and the chances of Home Rule for this generation would be fading into the far distance. But what did the right hon. Gentleman who spoke to-night say on the 22nd January last at Rothbury? I am quoting from the *Times* of 23rd January, 1892. He said—

“Questions such as the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, the registration of voters, local control of the liquor traffic, one man one vote, District Councils and Parish Councils, were ready for settlement, and would be dealt with by the Liberal Ministry immediately it came into power. It had been stated that the House of Lords would throw these Bills out. All he had to say was, let them try.”

Now what is the meaning of that? How are the House of Lords to try the policy of throwing out these Bills if they are not sent up from the House of Commons first? I want to know whether these seven or eight measures of Liberal reform are to be passed simultaneously, in the same Session, with the Home Rule Bill?

X

SIR G. TREVELYAN: I beg pardon. I think that report in the *Times* of my speech at Rothbury, a very remote village in the centre of Northumberland, is about twelve or fourteen lines long. I will send the hon. Member the report of my speech published by the Liberal Association there, as corrected by myself. If he will read that he will see what I really said.

MR. REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman will make allowance for me when he remembers that I am not a subscriber to the Liberal Association of Rothbury. The report in the *Times* was read, of course, by the right hon. Gentleman, but it was never corrected by him, and it is quite enough for my present purpose. If the right hon. Gentleman would take advice from me he would, instead of referring me to the Liberal Association of Rothbury, stand up and, in one sentence, say that he is entirely against any such policy as the *Times* has attributed to him.

SIR G. TREVELYAN: I am entirely in favour of the policy of bringing forward, one after another, those Liberal measures, and daring the House of Lords to throw them out. But that has absolutely nothing to do with this question of Irish Home Rule. I never said it was to be done in the same Parliament, or anything of the sort. If the House of Lords does venture to throw out either the Home Rule Bill or any of those Liberal measures, we shall see how the House of Commons will act.

MR. REDMOND: I feel myself in a worse position than before, because it now seems to be uncertain whether the Home Rule Bill is to be the first Bill, after all, to be submitted to the House of Commons and the House of Lords. However, I pass over that; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take some early opportunity of letting the Irish people know definitely, first, why he was unwilling to give us the information we asked for; and, secondly, whether he will protest against any delay with, or hanging up of, a Home Rule Bill beyond the Session in which it is passed by the House of Commons? In giving such information as we ask for, the Liberal Party would be acting wisely from their own point of view and that of the masses to whom they will have to submit their policy when the General Election comes. All I have to say, in conclusion,

is this: Let England and the English people and English Political Parties be under no misapprehension whatever as to this Irish question. Grant to Ireland a partial and halting measure of Home Rule, leaving power to the English Parliament to discuss and revise—thwart and destroy—Irish legislation, bring Irish Members to this House, and constitute it a sort of Court of Appeal to which the grievances of every section of the Irish people could be brought, and I say your last state will be worse than your first. Act in a spirit of distrust to the Irish people, and they will continue to act in a spirit of distrust to you. But, on the other hand, if you deal out justice to the Irish people with a free and generous hand; if, having made up your mind that Home Rule is necessary, you do not halt and “let I dare not wait upon I would” in your policy; if, having made up your mind that an autonomy ought to be given to Ireland, you go to the full logical length of that conviction and give to Ireland, in certain purely Irish affairs, supreme control of her own business, then I believe England will be repaid in the near future by having an end put to this Irish question which has been for generations the plague and the torture of this House and the disgrace of this English Empire, and Ireland will be repaid after her long and troubled and fevered history by being enabled at last to enter upon a new era of liberty, prosperity, and peace.

\*(7.50.) MR. W. JOHNSTON (South Belfast): I have been greatly interested and somewhat amused by the turn which the Debate has taken; and I have been impressed by the feeling that if Ireland is to have a Legislative Assembly granted to her, it would be desirable that those of her Representatives in this House who claim that position for her should first settle amongst themselves their own disputes. The Amendment which has been submitted by the hon. Member for West Belfast has been objected to in part by the hon. Member for Waterford, and I must leave these two gentlemen to settle between themselves the policy they will propound to this House as the policy of the Irish people. I am sure the House must have listened with great gratification to the “maiden” speech of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, who has come to this House to give assistance to the loyal minority of Ulster, and whose voice

will not be raised to break up the legislative union. We have been accused in Ulster sometimes of uttering bitter words concerning other sections of the Irish people, but in no part of Her Majesty's Dominions more than in my constituency is there a strong desire to see an advance made in the material and moral prosperity of the Roman Catholic subjects of the Queen in Ireland. We have to thank Her Majesty's Government for having on various occasions brought in measures for the promotion of the prosperity of Ireland, and we have regretted that by some sections of the Irish Party those measures have been bitterly opposed. The complaint now comes from them with a bad grace, that all they have desired has not been done for Ireland. I wish to give my strongest opposition to the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Belfast, who, as I know, does not represent the majority of that constituency. He may sit for that constituency at present, but another story will be told after the General Election, when the majority will send to this House a Representative who will give expression to their sentiments. We have been told that Ulster returns a majority of Nationalists to Parliament. It is so by a majority of one, but the votes that have been recorded for them are so small that we are certain to reverse that position at the General Election. We, at least, who represent the loyal minority in Ireland are not afraid of an election, because we know that the policy we advocate in this House is the policy of the loyalists of Ireland, and that they desire the maintenance of the Union as the best guarantee of the prosperity of their native land.

(8.35.) MR. DOUGLAS H. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme): The hon. Member for West Belfast alleges by his Amendment that this Parliament is unable to remedy Irish grievances, and the same remarks were made in the course of the Debate by Scotch and Welsh Members in regard to their own country. Now, at the General Election in the year 1886, the Unionist Party said, in reply to this demand, that if the question of Home Rule for Ireland were once entertained it would not be long before the same demand was put forward by Scotland and Wales. Of course, we were told that we were foolish to indulge in such predictions, but we had not long to

wait. Demands have been made for separate Parliaments for Scotland and for Wales, and I should like to ask where this multiplication of Parliaments is going to stop. We have been reminded by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bridgeton of what has taken place in Ireland at bye-elections; we have heard of clerical interference in Irish elections; we have been told that it is wrong to complain of clerical influence, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was very angry last week because Lord Salisbury had gone so far as to mention one of the Catholic Archbishops by name. The right hon. Gentleman was most indignant at it, but I would ask why should not a Catholic Archbishop, if he separate himself from his sacred office, and take to electioneering, be mentioned apart from that sacred office which he has abandoned, and in connection with the work he has substituted for it? As long as a priest confines himself to his functions, so long may his office be respected. I should like to remind the House of what has taken place in Ireland, and I should like to quote to the House two short extracts—I am not going to quote from a Unionist paper, I am going to quote from what may be regarded as the official Gladstonian organ, the *Star*, referring to the Kilkenny election in December, 1890. This was said upon the 22nd December by that paper:—

“But of all the work that has been done, the most important was accomplished this Sabbath morning, when, throughout the constituency, the blessing of Holy Church was practically pronounced upon Sir John Pope Hennessy's candidature. It amounts to this, that in almost every parish in the constituency the Holy Sacrament of Mass was adapted to purposes of political organization. Hennessy was not exactly blessed, nor Mr. Parnell denounced, from the steps of the altar, but it was very like it at 36 parish chapels in the constituency.”

The same correspondent upon the next day says:—

“At Ballyragget, voters, as they came up to the station, were taken into the priest's house for the last word of good counsel; at Johnstown, the priest was in the booth. All over the division priests acted as personation agents. At Gowran, each of three personation agents was in a black frock. In the electoral history of the world there is registered no device to compare with this. Voters found the priest so all-prevailing that some of them must have believed a ballot-box itself to be an ecclesiastical appurtenance with a priest inside it.”



These statements, I think, justify the Unionist Party in their contention that when a Home Rule Parliament is established in Dublin the most improper influences would be brought to bear upon the electors. We have been asking for a long time what the Home Rule policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian really is. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has made a statement with regard to that policy. He said, first of all, that Home Rule is not local government. But it has been dinned into our ears, and I have heard it stated over and over again at bye-elections, that the only thing meant by Home Rule is local government for Ireland—that local government was understood to mean that the Irish people were to have the power to deal with the supply of gas, water, electricity, and other matters of that kind; but now we have a statement from the right hon. Member for Derby that Home Rule means none of those things; we have it upon the right hon. Gentleman's authority that Home Rule is to be something very different. Then, the right hon. Gentleman referred to Canada: he asked us to look at the self-governing powers possessed by Canada; but are you prepared to give the same powers to Ireland as to Canada? Canada might, and could, raise an army or a navy; Canada could send Ambassadors to foreign Courts; it could impose protective duties, and yet, when Unionists said it was possible that Ireland might demand any one, or all of those, we are told that it is only a Unionist bogey. Are you prepared to give Ireland the same rights? I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, are these the powers that he would give Ireland? "No such thing," it is said; all that is meant is to give Ireland a subordinate Parliament. Yes; but the Irish Members say that it is not a subordinate Parliament that they are aiming at. We have heard it again from the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member for North-East Cork, speaking in Ireland, at Drogheda, on November 15th of last year, said:—

"They, on their side, had now an Irish Party united enough and formidable enough to stand no nonsense in reference to the pledges that the English Liberals had solemnly given them, and with the help of the people of

*Mr. Douglas H. Coghill*

Ireland they would succeed in giving back to the old country all the blessings of National unity and independence."

In all that there is nothing about a "subordinate Parliament." I think every man inside and outside this House knows full well the meaning of these words—"National unity and independence"—and that what is implied is a Parliament that would be supreme. That is what is put forward before the Irish people. In England, no doubt, the tone adopted is very different, and very different, too, to that adopted across the Atlantic. Here they say they are in favour of a subordinate Parliament to manage local affairs, but it is very different upon the other side. We have asked over and over again what the policy is, and we have complained over and over again of the old policy of concealment, obscurity, and silence. Are the powers they propose to give something like the powers possessed by the people of Canada? Now, we find that what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby would give the people of Ireland is something like what the Canadian people have; and very likely, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian comes back to the House, the first thing he will do will be to throw over that policy. We want to know, before the General Election takes place, what is the exact scheme of Home Rule that is to be the programme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. It is complained in this House by the hon. Member for West Belfast that sufficient attention is not paid to the opinions set forth by Irish Members; and the Gladstonian Party say that we do not represent the opinion of these Members; but only last year, on the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill, all the Irish Members went into one Lobby and the Gladstonian leaders went into the other. Thus, the right hon. Members for Derby and Newcastle deliberately tried to vote down the legitimate expression of Irish opinion. No charge is made more frequently in this House than that we disregard the opinions of the Irish people; but if those charges are to be made they should be made by somebody other than Members of the Gladstonian Party, and especially by leaders of that

Party. Last week, in the Division on Friday on the convicted dynamiters, I observed with much interest that the hon. Member for Rossendale considered it his duty in the first vote he gave as a Member of this House—and I watched it with great interest—to vote against his own leaders, and we had Members of the Gladstonian Party in one Lobby and the leaders in another, deliberately voting down the opinion of the Irish Members. The hon. Member for Rossendale—a new disciple so recently returned—voted against his leaders, and became a Dissident Liberal. And, by the way, with reference to the Debate upon the question of the release of these prisoners, I would like to ask whether it was one of the pieces of business to be entrusted to an Irish Parliament; because, if not, this Imperial Parliament would still have the eternal Irish question with us, and we should have it with us as much, if not more, than ever. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle denounced the right hon. Member for Birmingham for sitting on these Benches. For my part, I can see nothing wrong in it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle ought rather to be proud of it, for we all know that in the years 1885-6 the Tory Party were carrying on a small flirtation with Home Rule, and he ought to be pleased that the Members of the Tory Party have been won over to the old Liberal creed, and taken up the attitude formerly so firmly held by the Liberal Party, including the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, than whom, of course, we all know, no one more energetically denounced the idea of giving to Ireland a separate Parliament. There is small temptation, indeed, for the Unionists to join the ranks of the faithful, because we do not know how long they will be in favour of Home Rule as the man “convinced against his will is of the same opinion still,” and the time might come when we may see the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian travelling about the country and proclaiming from railway carriages that anyone who was so foolish and misguided as to believe in Home Rule must be either a lunatic or madman. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle said that he country was against the Government, but I do not gather that from the

number of English Members who were amongst the new Members who took their seats the other night. The tactics pursued at election after election by the Gladstonian Party showed that Home Rule by itself was not good enough to win upon. In North-East Manchester, where there is a large section of Irish people, it was not Home Rule that was put forward; in North Leeds it was thought better not to take it up, and a flagrant example of these methods was found in the bye-election that took place at Wisbech last summer. The question there was not whether the Gladstonian candidate was a fit and proper person to represent the constituency; the only question was as to the abilities of the wife of the hon. Member singing Irish airs with a touch of the real Irish brogue. We wish to know what the Home Rule Parliament is to be; the Home Rule question ought to be put fairly before the people, and I think if the question is put before the constituents, and when electors have an opportunity of deciding upon it, the people of this country will endorse once more the policy of having one Parliament for the whole of the United Kingdom.

(8.55.) MR. WILLIAM E. M. TOMLINSON (Preston): I must say that I do not believe that this question of Home Rule is a burning question throughout the country, and I would call the attention of the House to the extraordinary fact that for a considerable time during a speech of much interest and importance the Front Opposition Benches were absolutely tenantless, and that not one of the Gladstonian side of the House rose to continue the Debate. In fact, this Debate is a mere sham and parade, and I am afraid there is some idea of trying to carry the Amendment in the absence of a considerable portion of Members of the House. When hon. Members are so convinced upon this Home Rule doctrine why do they not rise to carry on the Debate upon an Amendment raising very important issues? In Ireland we have three Parties, one of which is bitterly hostile to Home Rule, and another of which is absolutely indifferent upon the question. I am one of those who think that this question of Home Rule does not excite any very great interest in this country, and I think the hon. Member will find

himself greatly mistaken if he really and *bonâ fide* endeavours to carry the next General Election on the cry of Home Rule without taking up local questions which are supposed to interest the country, and gradually putting them forward in the manner described by the hon. Member opposite. I naturally took considerable interest in the General Election of 1885. I was opposed by the hon. Member for North Tyrone. It is quite true that the hon. Member for North Tyrone in many of his speeches dealt largely with this question of Home Rule. For my own part I always on that occasion declined to follow the arguments of the hon. Member, because I did not conceive it possible that Home Rule could ever be brought forward in the House of Commons. I quite admit that the hon. Member had a better idea of what was coming than I did, and I quite admit that if I had known that we were so near raising a question of this kind I should not have remained so silent as I did in replying to his speeches. At the same time, my silence could not be construed as any attempt to minimise so important a question, nor could it in any way be described as coquetting with Home Rule. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House further. As I have said before, the attitude of the House and the manner in which the Debate has been carried on appear to me conclusive of the fact that this was a parade and a sham, a mere form, and that the question has been brought forward in a perfunctory way with the view of making a show. I believe it is unnecessary to discuss this question, and that those who appear now to support Home Rule know that if they left other questions out of sight at the Election their chances of return at the Election would be slight indeed.

(9.5.) COLONEL JOHN P. NOLAN (Galway, N.): I myself do not look on the Amendment as a sham. I look upon the Amendment as brought forward by my hon. Friend with very considerable ability for a specific purpose. The hon. Member for Preston, of course, was only joking when he said the Parnellite Members were not anxious for Home Rule. The hon. Member for Waterford defined what he meant by Home Rule, and it seems almost useless for any other Member of the Irish Party to do so until the questions he put

*Mr. William E. M. Tomlinson*

to the front Opposition bench have been answered. They are plain and simple questions, and I think it is absolutely necessary that they should receive a reply. I should say that this Amendment is not a sham, but a very real Amendment. This Amendment is really a reversion to the days of Mr. Butt. In the days of Mr. Butt we Irish Members were in the habit of bringing forward what have been called tentative or undefined motions for Home Rule. We used to make an almost annual motion in favour of Home Rule, and we succeeded in getting from about 6 to 20 Members to vote for us. We used to have a majority of Irish Members—very likely not more than a bare majority, but we had a majority always, and we succeeded in getting from 6 to 20 English Members to vote with us. In those times I think it was very good tactics to bring forward an undefined Motion, and the usual form of our Motion was that this House do resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Relations between England and Ireland. Mr. Parnell quite abandoned these tactics. He would not bring forward any Resolution in the House. He thought it was perfectly useless to ascertain how many English Members would vote for us. He threw that plan to the winds, and he brought pressure to bear upon the great English parties until Lord Carnarvon very nearly took up the question; and, finally, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian took it up and made it a great Party question. Then it was put to the House and a vote taken on it, but at that time it went against us. Of course the Liberal Party could not stand against the opposition of the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. John Bright, and many other very distinguished men. The verdict was temporarily given against us, but I believe that if the Irish Party only stood united in November last year they would now be going to the General Election with an absolute certainty of winning it. This Amendment is introduced as an undefined Amendment, almost an illusory Amendment. It is a declaration for Home Rule, and if any hon. Member votes for it he must vote for something labelled Home Rule. This Amendment merely compels an hon. Member to give some sort of vote for some kind of Home Rule. I think we would

have been better without this Amendment than with it, but now that it has been introduced—it is my own personal opinion—I should say we ought to vote for it just as we ought to vote for any pronouncement in favour of Home Rule. But I do not think it is a judicious one. I think it is rather letting people out of their pledges in place of binding them more closely to their pledges. That is the reason I consider the Amendment to be an injudicious one except so far as it gave an opportunity to my hon. Friend the Member for Waterford to address those very pointed interrogatories to the Front Opposition Bench. At the last General Election and afterwards there was a sort of compact or treaty that we were to get the old Home Rule Bill or something better. That was the position up to November last year. Then according to the proposals made to Mr. Parnell it was agreed that a certain number of Irish Members should stay in Parliament—34 was the number mentioned. This matter is a matter for the most urgent and immediate attention. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle spoke about that the other night. He said we must have the Irish Members remaining in the English House of Commons. That is the only modification of the old Bill that has been stated by the Front Opposition Bench. I have not the slightest objection to the whole of the Irish Members staying here when we have a Home Rule Government. If they stay here, they will keep their power here, and any power we get in Ireland will be something to the good. But, on the other hand, if some power is to be taken away from the Irish Parliament because a certain number of Irish Members stay here, it becomes a matter of the most vital importance, as Mr. Parnell pointed out, how many Irish Members stay here. Now, 34 is about one-third of the present Irish representation. It is said that because the Irish Members would be able to vote on Imperial Motions as well as on English and Scotch Motions in the House of Commons, their number should be reduced to one-third; but really that is an absurdity. I do not think that 34 Irish Members now vote upon every question in the House of Commons, and that number would not have as much power as three times

the number now has on strictly Imperial questions; and, consequently, to reduce the number of Irish Members is simply to reduce the powers of the Irish Members. It would be 34 Members instead of 103, and it would be a serious question indeed if the Laws that were made in Dublin were all to be revised in the House of Commons, and if only 34 Irish Members were here, either directly to support these propositions or indirectly to influence Ministers by voting for or against them on foreign questions. It is quite a different matter having no Irish Members here at all. If there were no Irish Members here the Government would then have to consider Ireland as it now considers Canada or Australia. I have some fault to find with the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Belfast for its vagueness, after the public declarations that the Irish Members were to be reduced to 34 made by various English speakers. The hon. Member for West Belfast said very little indeed about Home Rule. The reason was very simple. He is not only a great orator but a great tactician; and he saw the embarrassment it would cause to his friends on the Front Opposition Bench. The right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench do not desire to state what sort of Home Rule they are in favour of now. They say this is a great tactical advantage to keep it a secret, but I fail to see where is the tactical advantage. You want either to humbug the Irish voters by afterwards giving us less than we expected, or to humbug the English voters by giving us more than we expected. The hon. Member for Waterford has pointed out to the Front Opposition Bench how frequently he has tried to elicit the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and others on this subject, and how the Irish Members of all Parties went last November to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, and almost went on their knees to ask him to say something on the subject of Home Rule, and without any result; and what can be the tactical advantage of it? I do not believe much in that theory that Home Rule will be discovered at the right time, and I do very much fear that the Irish voters in Ireland may not have the proper means of making up their minds on this subject at the General Election. The Irish voters

were very moderate on this question. The Irish voters in England are men who have to a great extent adopted a new country and formed new ties—some for Liberals and some for Conservatives. A good many of them have formed local ties. If the Irish Members unanimously called upon them, as they did once or twice, for their support to enable Ireland to get a real measure of Home Rule, there can be no doubt that a very large number of these gentlemen would throw up their local ties and go for Home Rule. But how can they call upon them to do so when we do not know what the Home Rule is to be? The right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench could make it clear in one sentence. They might also make it a broad question and push it forward strenuously. What the Liberal Party are going to do when they get into power is, I consider, almost of as great importance as the question of what Home Rule is to be. The occupants of the Front Opposition Bench might very well say, "If you want a very small Home Rule Bill we will get it through Parliament; but if you want a very big one we will get it through the House of Commons all right, but it will be stopped in the House of Lords." I believe that is what will happen next Session. Then the Liberal Party might turn round to the Irish Members and say: "We must go on with our English Measures now." What we want is a large and sufficient Measure of Home Rule to be pushed through tenaciously and sent up to the House of Lords; and if they do not assent to it, then we should either bring in a Bill to abolish the House of Lords or declare a Dissolution. That would be the only way of taking the verdict of the electors on the particular Home Rule Bill that is needed. Lord Salisbury has threatened that he would use his influence with the House of Lords to throw out a Home Rule Bill out of the Lords unless the principles of it were first stated. Well, I think that is a challenge. I do not understand after that the reticence of the leaders of the Liberal Members in not telling us broadly and simply what is meant by Home Rule for Ireland. Curiously enough, in this Amendment a reference to a particular Land Bill has been mixed up in a very intricate fashion with the

*Colonel John P. Nolan*

general Home Rule Question, so that it is very difficult to disentangle it. If I vote for this Amendment, which I intend to do, and I think the Irish Members ought to do, it must be clearly understood that I do not agree to vote for the last half of it. It simply means this: that the hon. Member for West Belfast is so clever that he is able to tie a knot up I cannot disentangle. What the hon. Member said with reference to the Land Purchase Act is, I think, inconvenient. What Mr. Parnell said was very simple. We did think the Bill of last year was a very good one. We would have liked to change many points in it, but what was got by that Bill would not have been got but for Mr. Parnell—for I daresay Members would have managed to throw it out, but we brought them into the Lobby with us. They could not stand out, and so we got a credit for £40,000,000 or £50,000,000. A large number of Members objected to this pledging of English credit; but what Mr. Parnell knew was that, after he got a credit for £40,000,000 or £50,000,000 opened, it would be very difficult to close it. But it is very difficult to get money voted. Here was an opportunity, however, for doing so; and, although the Radicals might give us something considerable in the way of Home Rule, they would never have given a credit for £40,000,000 or £50,000,000. Mr. Parnell was most anxious to get this credit opened; not that he approved of the general details of the Bill. I have no private information as to his views—only his public utterances; but all his speeches were directed to getting this credit opened. Afterwards a new Parliament might bring in any measures to increase the advantages to the tenants. I think it is a little premature to say whether the Bill is good or bad. I attach very little importance to any views on that subject at this stage of the proceedings. The hon. Member for West Belfast has brought forward an absolutely indefinite Motion with regard to Home Rule. Anyone who likes may say, after the Division, I voted for a Home Rule proposal, but if he were asked "Which did you vote for—Parnell's Bill, or what particular kind of Home Rule," he could say, "Oh! that was not in the Amendment." If the desire was to get a large vote, then this was a

lever Amendment, but I do not see any object in a large vote. I think it a pity to have drawn up an Amendment with such vagueness. There is still ample time for the Front Bench men to set this matter right. They can make a perfectly happy family by simply getting up and defining Home Rule, and say that when the Liberals take up the measure, they mean to push it right through without giving way to any other measure. The 'arnellite Party as we are called—we do not repudiate the name; I would possibly call it the Parliamentary or Nationalist Party—are not indifferent to Home Rule. But we want precision; we want to know what we are to ask the Irish people to vote for. We ought with politeness, but humility, to ask gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench to throw a little light upon this subject—a little glimmer as to their course of action in the next Parliament. What are to be the principles we are to vote for, and what the application of the principles? I hope every Irish Member will join in that entreaty.

\* (9.35.) Mr. WEBB (West Waterford): An hon. Member opposite said there was a great want of reality in the Debate, and it is also said that Home Rule is dead. I do not agree with either assertion. Somehow Home Rule is always coming up. We are only at the commencement of the Session, and yet there is not a day the question has not been brought forward. An hon. Member brought the charge that we were inclined to be disingenuous regarding Home Rule, and that while using one language here we used a different language in Ireland. It appears no use saying over and over again what we are not afraid to say in Ireland as here, that in the matter of protective duties, or the Army or Navy, or questions of that kind, we do not desire to have any power under our Home Rule Bill. The hon. Member also made a charge that our Liberal friends did not vote with us always on Irish questions. That does not show want of sincerity, and it is quite a different thing from desiring to give us liberty to settle our own affairs. But we cannot leave out of notice the speech of the Prime Minister. It has been said the tendency of the majority in Ireland is backward; that all that is progressive in Ireland and all that is enlightened is in the minority. The majority might say

something very unpleasant of the minority, but we do not desire to make disparaging comparisons. Our desire is to try and elevate every Party in Ireland. We desire, also, that the minority should be strong and respected. We do not want to pull down, but to raise up. The whole object of this Parliament for ages was to degrade and pull down the majority, and it is only within recent years that they have emerged out of that attempted state of degradation. That they are not permanently degraded is due to their own innate qualities and powers. To say that the majority are unprogressive is contrary to the truth. Anyone who has travelled in Ireland must have seen the beautiful churches and institutions which these unprogressive and unenlightened people have raised. If a visitor to Ireland asked me to bring him to any similar institutions founded by the minority, I would have difficulty in finding them out. There are other institutions in Dublin of the same kind, such as the Hospital for the Dying. In Cork you find the same thing. Some of the great institutions there, such as the Institution for the Blind and the Institution of the Good Shepherd, are of the same class. Surely these are not the institutions of a backward or uncivilised people. In England, great country as it is, are there any institutions to compare with the institution of the Christian Brothers in Ireland? When education was banned in Ireland, after the people were only beginning to rise by the exertions of the Irish Parliament from the depths of ignorance to which you consigned them, the institution of Christian Brothers was founded and took up the work, and made exertions when there was no other popular educational institution in the country. There are now some 700 of these men who devote the whole of their lives, for nothing but the poorest living, to the toil of teaching the young, without hope of rising to higher positions such as is given to most men in other walks of life. I am quite unable to understand how any man with any knowledge of Ireland can attribute backwardness and ignorance to the majority of the Irish people when such qualities are found among them. We have a Corporation in Dublin elected by this retrogressive and backward people. Just in proportion as the backward majority obtained power in the

election, matters municipal were placed upon a right footing; and now Dublin possesses the best water supply perhaps to be found in any city in the United Kingdom. That was due entirely to the efforts of the majority as against the wishes of the minority. Every effort that has been made for good in Ireland in the present century has received the support of this backward and unprogressive majority, and has been opposed by the highly enlightened and civilised minority. When you wanted to reform the Corporations, to put an end to the infamous system of tithes, and to disestablish the Irish Church, it was not to the enlightened minority you appealed, but to the unprogressive and backward majority. I know for myself, having taken an active part in politics in Dublin for some time, that the only time I saw a meeting broken up with brickbats and stones was when some Protestants held a meeting in favour of Disestablishment, and it was broken up by other Protestants opposed to Disestablishment. I am prevented from going as fully as I could wish into the real character and conduct which sometimes disgraces the minority in Ireland; but I will not be thought unfair or out of order if, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Belfast riots. There never was such a state of things as arose in these riots; and that was not the work of the unenlightened majority, but of the highly educated and enlightened minority, who arrogate to themselves all the virtues. If I wanted to give a test by which to judge the spirit of the minority as compared with that of the majority, I would refer hon. Members to the song books of each Party. Let any man here who wants to know the real spirit of the minority in its purest form in Belfast buy a minority song book, and they will there see the sentiments of this enlightened minority, and let him buy a song book of the unenlightened majority, and contrast the spirit of the two. He will find in one a feeling of hatred and bitterness, and in the other nothing but a desire for union and kindly feeling. It is true that the majority did not always entertain this feeling. We would be more than human if we had not felt bitterly at one time towards this country who so cruelly oppressed us. But my own belief is, from what I know of the Irish people, that they have quite

*Mr. Webb*

as much of the civic virtues in their hearts—the very poorest of them—as the rich and wealthy have. I find, in moving among all classes of them—that there is a much more Christian spirit among the poor than among the rich—among that poor who are so much sought to be despised. It is quite possible that, as between the minority and majority, the paths of civilisation may run in different lines, but I firmly believe both are progressing. I believe that if the power were taken out of the hands of the minority, both sections would come to be on the best possible terms. A few years ago, when it was said that the Conservative Party were coquetting with us in this House, I visited a manufacturer in the North of Ireland. He was then in the best spirits regarding us and our people, and gave us the best character, both Catholics and Protestants. But now that there is a possibility of throwing us off they look upon us differently; and I heard that same man lately, when asked what he was doing with his Catholic workpeople, say, “Oh! he was quietly weeding them out.” That is what we fear will continue until the Catholic majority get upon more level terms with the minority. We are asked what could an Irish Parliament do better for us than the English Parliament can do? Well, I might answer, in what respect could any hon. Gentleman opposite manage my house as well as I can manage it; or how could this Government manage the affairs of France better than the Government chosen by the people of France? The Member for West Birmingham said that one of the difficulties he and his Party were now placed in was that now there were two Parties amongst us, and they did not know who they were dealing with, whereas before they could have dealt with Mr. Parnell. It appears to me that you will now have a much more solid ground to go upon in the knowledge of the real opinions of those whom you are dealing with, because, after the next General Election, you will have the real opinions of the Irish people, each constituency giving its own. Then you will not be able to say that, in accepting whatever Home Rule we may accept, it is being accepted on the fiat of one man. I shall only add one word more, and it is

as that I do think, when one Party  
ers upon a course that brings it to  
position of criticising its best friends  
l receiving the cheers of its worst  
mies, that Party can hardly be adopt-  
its proper course.

9.55.) COLONEL SAUNDERSON :

, I should not wish that the  
bate on the Address should terminate  
hout some expression of the great  
effelt, I believe, universally in Ireland  
the affliction that has befallen the  
yal Family. The Irish people, with  
their faults, are a warm-hearted  
ple, ready to enter into the joys and  
rows of those they know and like ;  
d the Duke of Clarence went the right  
y about acquiring the sympathies of  
e Irish people. He came over and  
ed in the country ; and we had the  
aching letter from the Prince of Wales  
the Lord Mayor of Dublin that he was  
ry happy there. And the Irish people  
tered into the happy and auspicious  
ent that promised to crown his life  
ith gladness ; and when the tragic  
ent occurred which cut off his young  
fe, it struck a sad chord in the Irish  
eart. I hope it will be a solace to Her  
lajesty and to the Prince and Princess  
f Wales to realise that their sorrow is  
ared by, I believe, the great majority  
f the Irish people. Now, I would  
ay a few words with regard to the  
Amendment you are now considering  
nd to the speech of the hon.  
Member for West Belfast. The Amend-  
ment would, I think, have served its pur-  
ose well had it not been for the fact  
hat behind the hon. Member for West  
Belfast sat the hon. Member for Water-  
ford. The Amendment undoubtedly  
aised a question of the very highest im-  
ortance. It is to this effect : That the  
British Parliament, having tried every  
method to satisfy the wants and require-  
ments of the Irish people, and, having  
ailed, had better give up the hopeless  
ask ; and then it went on to criticise a  
Bill which we passed last year. Now, I  
ould ask any fair man which part of

this Amendment was the most important ?  
To consider a Bill which we passed last  
year, which received the sanction of the  
then Leader of what was then a  
united Party, or to consider whether  
Ireland is to be dissociated for ever  
from British Parliamentary control ?  
I wonder that the hon. Member for  
West Belfast did not see he laid himself  
open to this objection, that he ignored  
the important and vital part of his  
Amendment. He spent twenty minutes  
of his speech in attacking the language  
of the Prime Minister, which he said  
was insulting to the nation. However  
strong and objectionable to the Irish  
Members that language might have  
been, it is mildness itself compared with  
the language which hon. Gentlemen have  
recently used about each other. The  
hon. Member for West Belfast said very  
few words about the main or Home Rule  
portion of his Amendment, and I do not  
think he occupied four minutes by the  
clock in his observations about Home  
Rule. Yet his whole contention is that  
as the House has failed in the past in  
dealing with Irish questions, including  
the question of Land Purchase, Home  
Rule ought to be granted. The hon.  
Member, in the matter of Home Rule,  
occupies a very critical and a very deli-  
cate position. He does not like to say  
anything to embarrass his friends on the  
Front Opposition Bench. He appears  
to me to occupy the position of a  
Nationalist waiter attending to the  
commands of his friends above the  
Gangway. That may answer the pur-  
pose of the Liberal Party and his  
Liberal friends, but he makes a grand  
mistake if he thinks that a course  
of that kind will ever secure  
a great following in Ireland. We  
had a speech from the hon. Member  
for Waterford of a very different kind.  
The hon. Member, with whom I entirely  
disagree, whom I am ready to oppose in  
this, and do my best to oppose by all  
means in Ireland, is at any rate a foe-  
man worthy of any man's steel. He puts



forward something to hit at. He is not an oratorical eel that comes in as the hon. Member for West Belfast did on Home Rule and steps out on Land Purchase. The hon. Member for Waterford raised this Debate from the position into which it had been degraded by the Committee speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bridgeton and the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast to its proper level of a Government Debate, before a General Election, brought forward in this House with the object of centring the opinion and attention of the British people on one of the greatest questions that they have ever had to consider. We learned from the hon. Member for Waterford exactly what his idea of Home Rule is. I believe his views are shared by the hon. and gallant Member for Galway and the whole of his Party, and from what the hon. Member for Waterford said, and from the reception his speech met with from his present friends and former allies, we must conclude that his definition of Home Rule is a definition which accords with the views and which had the general assent of the majority of the Gentlemen sitting opposite. His idea is, so far as I can make out, that this Parliament is to retain supremacy. I must say it is an Irish supremacy, because it is a supremacy that consists in this, that the Irish Members in full force shall have the power of coming over here to London to sit in this Assembly and to assist in directing the course of British Imperial affairs, whereas the British Parliament shall not have any authority whatever to interfere in Irish affairs. That is not my idea of reciprocity. Still I am glad to have the authoritative definition from a united party on the subject of Home Rule, because we have had no authoritative opinion from the Front Opposition Bench. I do not believe it exists. The Home Rule of the Front Opposition Bench depends altogether upon the state of parties after the next General Election. We know by the answers of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bridgeton that his mind is affected by the volume of opinion coming from the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. He gave us every intimation of the reasons why he became a Home Ruler, and apparently it was because he disapproved

*Colonel Saunderson*

of the arrangement of the borough boundaries of Dublin. As regards the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, he has laid it down as his final opinion that he will never accept Fenian Home Rule. He has not defined what Fenian Home Rule means, and if a large and united Nationalist Party in the next Parliament sit below the Gangway, and he finds himself in the position of leader of the Party that has not a sufficient backing in England and Scotland and Wales, the word Fenian will become a very elastic term. Now, Sir, it is said you are to grant Home Rule not because Ireland is a country tyrannized over, ground down beneath the heel of the Saxon, but forsooth because the Irish people have not swallowed the Land Purchase Bill with sufficient avidity. I thought the hon. Member for West Belfast would have supplied us with some more sufficient reason than that for dismembering the Empire. But it was simply and solely because enough money had not been advanced to the Irish people under the Land Acts that the hon. Member for West Belfast justified his demand for Home Rule. I am sorry the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant for Ireland is not here, because I wanted to give him a bit of advice. It is the greatest possible mistake to quote from any speech of any Gentleman opposite unless you have the quotation in your hand. I have always come down to the House to make a speech on the Irish Question with a considerable sheaf of paper in my hands. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, thinking it was my speech, have called out "Read, read!" But it was not my speech; it was elegant extracts from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite. When my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary said that hon. Gentlemen opposite had interfered with Land Purchase by asking the Irish tenants not to buy, the hon. Member for North Longford interrupted him in an almost violent manner, and said, "No, no"; "Quote, quote." My right hon. Friend, not having sufficient experience, had not the quotation by him. But here it is. On the 28th February the Member for North Longford said:—

"The farmer who bought his land to-day would, when a Home Rule Parliament was in three or four years' time, be very sorry he had been in such a hurry."

do not suppose the hon. Gentleman will say that that was not inducing the Irish tenants not to buy their farms.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.) : And mighty good advice too.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON : That may be, but the House will now understand how it is that the Irish tenants have held somewhat aloof from taking advantage of the Land Purchase Act.

MR. T. M. HEALY : Will you read the context of my speech ?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON : If I had to read all the speeches of the hon. Member I would never have done. The hon. Gentleman has not spoken, and we can give us the whole passage. Therefore, Sir, I was going to say that if the Land Purchase Act has not gone down with that rapidity which some of its supporters hoped, one of the reasons is that the chosen and trusted leaders of the Irish people have advised Irish tenants over and over again to refrain from purchasing under the Act, and to wait for better times, when they will get their land, as they were told by the hon. Member himself, at prairie value. Sir, the test by which the Irish policy of the Unionist Government is to be tried is not the test of the success of one measure, such as the Irish Land Purchase Act, but the test of the success of their whole policy during the last six years ; and in order to test that policy it is absolutely necessary for us to consider what was the task that the Unionist Government undertook, and whether they have completed that task with success. We undertook to govern Ireland under the laws of this Imperial Parliament, and to make Ireland a peaceful and prosperous country, and the record of the last six years proves conclusively that we have succeeded in our task. It is the duty of any speaker on the opposite side to show to the House and the country that the Unionist Party

have failed in this great task. The hon. Member for West Belfast never even attempted to do so. All he said was that the population of Ireland had largely decreased since the Union. I believe it has ; but I venture to maintain that 5,000,000 of well-to-do and thriving Irishmen are far better than 8,000,000 of Irish paupers. The present Irish population is ten times more wealthy than Irishmen were at the time of the Union, and the commercial prosperity of the country has steadily advanced. Take the savings banks, and you will find that the capital of the Irish people has rapidly increased. Take the joint-stock banks, the commercial returns, the trams, and you will find all along the line—

MR. T. M. HEALY : Which line ?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON : All along the Irish line—that prosperity has steadily increased. Then take the question of the condition of the country. When the Unionist Party, a few years ago, undertook the task of governing Ireland, they were met with difficulties which had never been experienced by any British Government before. Never before in the history of this country had a British Government found itself confronted by those who opposed the law of the land in Ireland, and by right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had been themselves responsible for maintaining the law, and who deliberately banded themselves with the opponents of the law in Ireland against the Government. It was said, if you pass a Coercion Bill, you will force crime under the surface ; but the condition of Ireland at present, so far as crime is concerned, compares favourably with her condition at any previous period. Five years ago there were 5,000 persons boycotted, but now there are none ; and, from every point of view, that is one of the greatest triumphs achieved by the Unionist Party. This is the only Session for many years past when we have met without some Irish Member being in gaol.

MR. T. M. HEALY : There is one English Member in gaol. (Cries of "De Cobain," and "Hastings!")

COLONEL SAUNDERSON : I think it will be found that Irish Members in

future will be very shy of appealing to British sympathy by undergoing intermittent periods of incarceration and retirement. The arrangement was this: Hon. Members opposite, having fairly stated their intentions, went over to Ireland and defied the law, and were put in gaol, and they appealed from their prisons to the sympathies of the British people, some with clothes and some without them. And then their Saxon sympathisers, not willing to allow them to suffer alone, came over and shared their fate. Even distant Cornwall sent us a martyr from Camborne, and he appealed to the British people, but found to his surprise that he could not elicit the sympathy he had expected. Apparently, the opinion of the British people was that when he was in prison picking oakum he was engaged for the first time in his life in a really useful and interesting occupation. The right hon. Member for Newcastle was stirred in his soul by the condition of the hon. Member for North-East Cork when he refused to use those clothes to which I have referred, and the right hon. Gentleman said he was "a spectacle to the civilised world." Right hon. Gentlemen opposite, not having a sense of humour, failed to see the comic side of the question which the British people perceived. I venture to say that the Member for Mayo and the Member for North-East Cork have learned a lesson by their recent incarceration which they will never forget. They went to gaol as they have been in the habit of doing periodically, but the British people absolutely forgot their existence; and, wonderful to relate, after all their manifold sufferings, there is hardly at the present moment a county in the South and West of Ireland which they can visit without police protection. The game is not worth the candle, for martyrdom is no longer a trump card. Eviction was a trump card which was played with great success in those "Remember Mitchelstown" days. But eviction failed to elicit the sympathies of

*Colonel Saunderson*

the British people, because they found out that those unfortunate Irish tenants were evicted not because they could not pay their rents, but because they would not pay their rents, and would not pay their rents because they dared not when they were ordered not to do so by the Member for Mayo and his friends. The eviction sham failed, and what about the coercion sham? There never was a greater sham played out in this country. There is just as much coercion now as there was two years ago, but we have no flights of English Members coming over to Ireland, and returning to England to make violent speeches on English platforms detailing their horrible experiences of the reign of "Bloody Balfour." I am a subscriber to *United Ireland*, but I see nothing in it now about "Bloody Balfour;" nor have I seen in the paper of the other Party any allusion to "Sanguinary Jackson." It must be a consolation to the Leader of the House to see that the violent vituperation which was learned by those on the other side at his expense, and which was developed to heights to which no Irishman ever attained before, is now entirely devoted by them to describing the moral enormities and political turpitude of each other. All these shams have been exposed, and cannot again be made use of in this country. What is the next sham? I imagine it will be Home Rule, and I expect that opinion is shared by hon. Gentlemen opposite of both Parties; for I have observed in the speeches of the Parties to which the Member for Belfast and the Member for Waterford respectively belong certain grave doubts expressed as to the reality of the Home Rule of the right hon. Member for Derby and the right hon. Member for Newcastle. What failure is there in Ireland? It is peaceful, and crime has disappeared. The National League, which we were told was too strong for the law, has practically ceased to exist, and lies shattered and dis-

red in the dust. What about the of Campaign, which was to destroy r efforts to maintain law and ? What has happened in New rary, which was to have been the polis of regenerated Ireland? I saw her day that the O'Brien Arcade, magnificent structure of which we so much—the culminating point of nalist architecture—had ceased to ; to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and ecome the property of the hon. er for South Hunts. I ventured ggest to my hon. Friend that he l for ever retain the O'Brien le in its integrity, and outside it a statue of the Member for North-Cork in his Tullamore clothes. If statesman was so handed down to e generations they would know Ireland would have been and what atues would have looked like if the of Campaign had succeeded. While is a laughable side to these ques- there is also a tragic side to them ; is the side of the tenants who were l and betrayed by the hon. Member layo and his friends. It is difficult cuse the course pursued by those its ; but yet there is one great e, for the men they had learned to and to obey had promised that if refused to pay their rents they l never be the losers. But what een the result? I have in my hand esult of this arrangement between

Members opposite and their un- dupes, who are now starving on oadside. It appears that the total ; from the 1st of August to the 31st eember, 1891, to the "wounded ars" and those isolated tenants who abandoned by the National League, uted to £11,456 1s. 2d. The hon. ber for Mayo stated that there were 5 evicted families, numbering 7,500 , at the present moment on the s of the Federation. If we divide 456 by 1,495, we arrive at the fact for five months £1 10s. 8d. per th, or 7s. 8d. per week, has been for the support of each family, or, her words, 2½d. a day per head for e who obeyed the hon. Members site.

R. DILLON: That is more than y of the landlords have given.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: For that interruption I am very glad ; it is by the hon. Member for Mayo who makes an assertion which he cannot prove. I have quoted from his own accounts, published in his own newspaper, and the result is that these miserable tenants who obeyed him and forsook their homes in which they had lived in happiness and peace all their lives are living on a pittance of 2½d. a day. I would like to know what those men would have said if the hon. Members had gone down to Tipperary and said that they would give them 2½d. a day to leave their homes. The crowning feat of all is, that these poor men, having found that they had been betrayed and made fools of, have gone back, and have refused to give up their shanties at the assurances of the hon. Members. Never has the policy of a Government during six years triumphed more gloriously than this Government along a more difficult line. And yet we are to give up all this and grant Home Rule. Whose Home Rule? In my early days there was only one Ireland. Then it was discovered that there were two Irelands—law-abiding Ireland and criminal Ireland—that was the discovery of the hon. Member for Bridgeton. Then came the Union of Hearts, that political espousal, and as a result there was an increase in the Irish family. There are now three Irelands—loyal Ireland, dis- loyal Ireland, and the priests' Ireland—to which the hon. Member for West Belfast belongs. And then we have Parnellite Ireland, to which the hon. Member for Waterford belongs.

DR. TANNER: Kept by the Tories.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: Can any right hon. Gentleman opposite, who hopes some day to occupy a responsible position in the country, really conceive that he can possibly frame a Home Rule Bill which would satisfy all the demands of all the various sections now fighting for the mastery in Ireland ; it passes the wit of man. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, however, do agree on one point—and it is the only one in the world on which they do agree—that they must have the control of the police. I do not at all wonder at it. I will give an illustration from a speech made the other day at the Waterford Election ; it gives a forecast of what Home Rule would be. It is

part of a speech made by the hon. Member for North-East Cork. He says:—

"On Friday night Dr. Fitzgerald announced publicly in Dublin that if we came down here to Waterford we would be maimed and wounded for the crime of addressing our fellow-countrymen."

MR. J. G. FITZGERALD: I never made such a speech; I never had any intention to maim or wound the hon. Gentlemen. They must have taken some body else for me.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I never said it was the hon. Gentleman; I was merely quoting from the *Freeman's Journal* part of a speech by the hon. Member for North-East Cork. I will leave the hon. Gentleman to settle with his late colleagues as to who Dr. Fitzgerald is. The hon. Member for North-East Cork went on to say:—

"The Police Authorities had full notice of that intention to murderously assault us here to-day. To-day, instead of seeing fair play they have batoned our men and given every opportunity that men could give to other men to murder and assault us in the streets of Waterford. But the day will come, please God, when the Irish people will have command of their own police."

Now, Sir, what did that mean? It meant that the hon. Member for North-East Cork was looking forward to the happy day when he would have command of the Irish Police. I wonder what the Member for Waterford will think of that? I believe that the Irish Constabulary—whose chief occupation of late has been to protect hon. Members when visiting their own constituencies—is a safer force to have to deal with than this Prætorian guard which hon. Members opposite hope to conjure up when they get Home Rule. A Home Rule Parliament, Home Rule Judges, Home Rule juries, and Home Rule police will indeed make Ireland a happy land. Will any man who has thought dispassionately on these matters consent for a single moment to place his life, the lives of his family, and his property at the disposal of such a combination? The section of the Irish people I represent—which includes many Roman Catholics—would never sanction it. We have no religious rancour amongst us in Ireland at present, and I challenge hon. Members opposite to point to one sentence that I or my friends have uttered which tended to religious animosity; but is there anyone

*Colonel Saunderson*

who blames us when we declare our intention to resist to the utmost such a state of affairs. At the Waterford election—I now allude to Tannerism—the hon. Member for North-East Cork would have been absolutely skinned by the Tanners if he had not escaped under the protection of the police. I can assert that whatever the exigencies of British parties may demand, whatever politics they may choose to adopt, we, constituting a very large and very powerful section of the Irish people, will never consent for one moment to obey such an authority. And this is the policy that hon. Gentlemen propose to go to the country with. To bring in a Home Rule Bill, which they dare not define, to satisfy the Irish people, which although they hate all Britons, hate each other more. To produce a Home Rule Bill that will satisfy and bring peace to Ireland is a task beyond even the wit of the right hon. Member for Midlothian. I hope that the majority of the House will reject this Amendment, and that the rejection will foreshadow the rejection of this policy at the next election; that as the House refuses to admit that the British Parliament is unable to maintain the law and satisfy the requirements of Ireland, the British people at the next election will re-echo our decision, and decide that the policy of Great Britain in the future shall be that Ireland shall remain under the authority of the British Parliament.

(10.55.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I have seldom listened to a speech with more satisfaction than that just delivered by the hon. and gallant Gentleman. I hope we may have a few more such speeches from Members of the Orange Party, because the effect on these Benches will be most salutary, and the more the hon. and gallant Gentleman rubs in the salt and dwells on the differences which exist in Ireland between the various sections of the Nationalist Party the better for Home Rule. I think, however, if the hon. and gallant Gentleman is going to play the Tory game, that is hardly the policy to pursue. I think the policy of the First Lord of the Treasury would be not to offer insults to both sections of the Irish Party. In the language of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, we are all "in one red burial

blent." I may tell the hon. and gallant Gentleman that if he has his sport against us to night—sport which we can always appreciate—our time is shortly coming; the Local Government Bill is about to be introduced. We hear a great deal about the details of the Home Rule Bill; why does not the hon. and gallant Gentleman ask for details of the Local Government Bill? How ardently he longs for that Bill, how fully he believes in it, how the Orange drum will be beaten at all the cross-roads in Ulster to the glory of the First Lord of the Treasury. We have our troubles and trials which it is not for me to seek to minimise, but I will not consent to make the differences which exist between myself and my late colleagues the sport of the British Philistines in the British House of Commons.

MR. P. O'BRIEN: That is what you did when you killed Parnell.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The hon. and gallant Gentleman is now much amused at the downcast and fallen condition of Ireland, but she will rise like the Phoenix from the ashes, as she has done many a time before—after '98, '48, and '68, and only the epitaph of the First Lord of the Treasury remains to be written on the Irish tomb. Unless the Irish question is settled by statesmen who have some conception of its magnitude you will find some haunting form hovering round which will yet crush you. At any rate, Sir, the worst medicine from the Tory point of view is to pour poison and gall into the wounds, and I can retort that those who have heard the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman have some conception of what we have to stand in Ireland. It is, no doubt, great sport to hon. Gentlemen upon the other side of the House to hear the sentiments uttered on behalf of a class of men in Ireland who, by your decisions in your Judicial Land Courts in Ireland, have been robbing and slandering the Irish people for centuries and generations. Search your Blue Books dealing with Ireland, and you will find in them the record of your robberies. Your accusation against us is that we—the sons of a people having a Government and powerful Empire to contend against, and in an entrenched camp of the enemy—have not wholly succeeded in the task

we have taken up. No, Sir; it is true that we have not succeeded—as yet; but we have not yet done, and we feel that, whatever be the dissensions which at present exist amongst the Irish Members, the healing hand of time will come to repair them, and that Members who have borne no part in the dissensions and tribulations of this time will carry forward the Green Flag of the country. I hope that the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman to which we have listened to-night will be printed *verbatim* in every National newspaper in Ireland, and I hope that his words will be read in every home in Ireland, and I believe it will do good; the rancour he has expressed on behalf of the landlord minority as his contribution towards the settlement of the Irish question will, I think, go far to bring about a settlement of the difficulties that now exist in the Irish ranks. I pass from that, and I ask what is the material upon which the hon. and gallant Gentleman depends? He wants to know what kind of Home Rule we are going to have. What, he asks, is the kind of Home Rule that the Liberal Party intend to put forward? He asks. Are we going to have "Popkin's Plan"; is it going to be Canadian Home Rule; or the Home Rule of Parnell; or that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby? The hon. and gallant Gentleman said you cannot satisfy everybody, and therefore he argues that you ought to try and satisfy nobody. I must compliment the hon. and gallant Gentleman upon the speech he has made here to-night. For my part I do not intend to give hon. Members opposite anything to hit at. I do not know whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman has ever heard of the remarks of a French general—"My children, you have come here to kill others, and not to get killed yourselves." Therefore, when the hon. and gallant Member opposite compliments the hon. Member for Waterford upon his speech, I begin to think that there is something in it that should be avoided. So far as I am concerned I do not intend to play the Tory game. We may be told that there are differences, and that on this question of Home Rule for Ireland, English statesmen differ among themselves, and differ from Irish statesmen, and that Irishmen differ amongst themselves;

that some say there is one way of conducting a campaign and some another. I do not pretend to make people comprehend this Home Rule Question; I do not attempt upon this occasion to teach my grandmother to suck eggs. Those who have to deal with it have a difficult question—a great and weighty task before them. But we shall have to be reckoned with in the settlement as we have had to be reckoned with before, and for my part I say that I see no reason to shake my confidence in the Liberal Party. I believe in the honesty of its intentions, and I have read no declarations by any Liberal statesman regarding the Home Rule Bill to change my mind from that day in 1886, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian made his statement upon that measure. So far as my judgment goes I think the English people, instead of showing themselves to be little-minded, have shown the greatest magnanimity in this matter. I have not hesitated to say it in Ireland, and I do not see why I should hesitate to say it here. My judgment is that "too many cooks spoil the broth," and that if we were content to follow the policy adopted from 1885 to 1891 by a united Irish Party, after the next General Election it would be possible to pass a Bill which will satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people. There is only one other remark. The hon. and gallant Gentleman desired to show the great success of the Unionist policy; that the Irishmen "were down in the dust and ashamed to be seen," and he went on to show how the Unionists had been successful all over the country. After the tremendous chain of successes which has been achieved I should have expected the hon. and gallant Gentleman to have gone on to advise the First Lord of the Treasury to dissolve Parliament at once, and go to the country in a blaze of glory. But that is the last thing the hon. and gallant Gentleman wants; the last thing they want is to be brought face to face with their constituents, and the strang thing is that, while the Irish Members are told that they cannot go to their constituents without police protection, we are most anxious to go, and yet cannot go. The Debate has taken a wide range; but I say it has taken a very

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

fortunate range for Her Majesty's Government. A Motion was brought forward to-night for the purpose of exposing the failure of the great plan of Irish pacification passed by the Unionist Ministry; and yet instead of considering that question straightway we started to count our chickens before they were hatched, and to discuss a Home Rule Bill which has not yet been produced in a Parliament that has not yet been elected. I think that has been a very fortunate thing for Her Majesty's Government. After the speech of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh—whose appearance in the House both sides I am sure must welcome—no person, no Tory, could deny that this great panacea for Ireland has been a miserable failure. The hon. Member called it a failure; he admitted it to be a dead failure, and proceeded to give reasons why he thought so.

**MR. DUNBAR BARTON :** I did not say it was a failure. I admitted that it had faults, but not that it was a failure.

**MR. T. M. HEALY :** That was my impression; that he had twice used the phrase, but I am sure that the hon. and learned Gentleman will now withdraw the expression if he has used it. The hon. and learned Gentleman admits that there has been failure in connection with the Bill. The hon. Member for West Belfast has been greatly blamed for bringing forward a single measure as an illustration of the necessity for Home Rule and as an illustration of the fact that the British Parliament is unable to legislate for Ireland. It is true it is a single measure, but it was brought forward as a great bulwark and buttress of the Unionist Party, and it was put forward as such, not only by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, but by Lord Salisbury and other statesmen of the Unionist Party. The Irish Members are, I contend, entitled to rely upon the failure of a measure of this kind as further proof of the inability of the English Parliament to deal with Irish questions. We know what human nature is, and

know that selfishness is a very ingredient in it; and I say if this was a success, and if it had offered advantages to the Irish tenants, they would have taken advantage of it; it is a rare, and it matters nothing what I three or four years ago, when we are living with a Bill passed last year, at happened in 1881? Never was there a more powerful organisation than Land League of those days. They asked the people to test the Act then and before availing themselves of it; yet, no sooner was the Act passed than 40,000 originating notices were issued in three weeks because the Irish people believed that it would be for their advantage. In 1887 we had the same experience. In regard to the Act of 1881, not a single fraction of money has been advanced, nor has a single transaction taken place under it. Why is that? It certainly is not due to any speeches of the Irish Members. I maintain that the Act is a failure because the First Lord of the Treasury refused to take the advice; but not only did he refuse the Irish advice, but he refused to take advice from any quarter of the House. He was advised by Irish officials of great experience and judgment that his scheme would not work; but, of course, the right hon. Gentleman disregarded their advice. What he said was, "I am Irish myself. I believe I know Ireland better than any Irishman." Then he said and puts in this Insurance Clause, which it is due to the memory of Mr. Gladstone to say was—I believe: I only know from recollection—was opposed by quite as much as by us; so that before we were *ad idem* on that point. The right hon. Gentleman was distinctly advised that the Irish tenants would not be exempted by 20 per cent. reduction; and he told him that at the time, and that turned out to be the fact. The Irish Member to-night, who had the task laid upon him, as the apostolic successor of the First Lord of the Treasury, to defend a Bill which, of course, he was obliged to do with framing into law, was obliged to admit the extraordinary fact, that in the first six months of the present Act no money had been applied for, and only £80,000 applied for, and in the first six months of the Ashbourne Act over half a million of money has been applied for on behalf of some

thousands of tenants. And what was his excuse? "Oh," he said, "they are all going in for the Ashbourne money." That is exactly our case. The landlords—and I do not blame them—do not like your paper. They want your sovereigns. What is the good of the Irish Secretary telling them that his paper is as good as Consols if the landlords do not think so? Of course, it is exactly the same with the £1 notes of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, I am sure, believes that there is nothing like a £1 note. He says the financiers of the City will not take £1 notes. He says they prefer the solid metal. The Irish landlord has a great streak of the City man in him on that point. These landlords may be very dull men on a great many points, but when you come to where their heart is—the region of their pockets—no amount of rustle of paper will fetch them. They want the ring of the money; as we say in Ireland the *arragaseesh*—the money down. You may praise your Land Stock as much as you please, you may flourish it before the eyes of the Irish landlords, you may rustle it into a Wagner harmony; but if the Irish landlords will not take it up, what is the good of it? That is the state of the case; your Land Stock is a drug in the market in this sense, that it is not applied for, and the people will not take it; and to tell us at once that this Stock is of great value, but that they will not have it, is to take part in more or less of a farce. Who is it that has given the most deadly blow to the Land Stock of the right hon. Gentleman? It is one of the right hon. Gentleman's own Ex-Attorney-Generals—Mr. Justice Gibson—who, the other day, in having to deal with this question, gave a deadly stab to the great Act of 1891. What was his view? A landlord had been offered £18,000 in chinking sovereigns for a property in County Down by an outside land jobber—a speculator! The tenants came in and said: "We will give a great deal more; we will give you as much as the Land Commission will allow us to pay." The one was, I think, about 15, and the other about 20, years' purchase, the tenants giving five years more than this land jobber. What did Mr. Justice Gibson say? "Yes," said Mr. Justice



Gibson, "you will give it in stock that is below par." Well, I think that was a very shrewd thrust at the measure of the right hon. Gentleman, and that is exactly what is hindering transactions. The landlords do not know the value of your stock; and I say that the Amendment of my hon. Friend is an Amendment, so far as that portion of it is concerned, which I should have thought would have been boomed by the Orange quarter opposite. The other difficulty is the difficulty about the insurance. I have no doubt that the Irish Secretary quoted me correctly; but what I had in my mind was this: that so far as the rents are concerned, you compel the Irish tenants, willy-nilly, to guarantee one another. If I spoke of insurance at all when I should have spoken of the rents it is only an error of phrase; but the idea remains, namely, the idea that one man who is an honest, thrifty tenant has to pay the piper for some other man in another portion of the county because he happens to be behind in his instalments. Well, then the other defect in the Act is the £50 limit. Now, we are at odds with some of our colleagues from Ireland as regards this matter. I do not wish to labour that point needlessly, but at any rate one effect it will have undoubtedly is that the landlords—to use a phrase used last Session—are unwilling to "chess-board" their estates. They do not want to sell them piecemeal. They want to sell them altogether or not at all. These are the reasons why your Act has been a failure. It is no pleasure to us to chronicle it as a failure. We only chronicle it as an instance of the chronic inability of this House to legislate for Ireland. If my hon. Friend, instead of taking the Land Purchase Act to hang his Amendment upon, had taken a small measure, an attenuated measure, I would be perfectly satisfied to rest the case upon it. I will take a small measure, and I am prepared upon it to rest the validity of this Amendment. Last year we passed through this House with enormous difficulty a little measure called the Drainage and Improvement of Land Act—a measure so microscopic that it escaped the observation of the hon. Member for Camberwell, who is blocker-in-ordinary to Her Majesty's Government. The effect of it was to enable judicial tenants

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

to borrow money from the Board of Works for the drainage of their holdings. What happened? It reached the Upper House, and there every Peer of Parliament interested in Irish land came down with one accord and strangled this little Bill. I challenge any man to say that this Bill had anything contentious in it. It was taken out of the Bann Drainage Bill which the Government found themselves unable to pass; and Lord Cadogan was obliged to get up at the Table of the House of Peers and to announce that this Drainage Bill was one that he could not invite the attention of their Lordships' House to during the present Session. Well, you think yourselves able to legislate for Ireland, and you cannot pass a little Bill of this kind. Now, I say, that any Bill introduced by an Irish Member, even if you pass it with enormous time, labour, and trouble in this House, the moment it goes beyond that hall, it has the axe of the executioner levelled against it. What has happened in this House for the last 12 years? We have been keeping up the fight so far as that goes, but so far as legislative enactment goes, I can scarcely remember anything except such grafts as we have been able to make on Government Bills; but, so far as actual legislation is concerned, the whole of the Irish Party have been engaged for the last 12 years in the work of Sisyphus, bringing in Bills, laboriously rolling them up to Third Reading, and when they crossed the Lobby, finding them slain in the home of Toryism on the other side; and, therefore, so far as we are concerned, this Amendment, in instancing the Land Purchase Bill as one of the Bills proving the failure of your legislation, is only taken as a further example, because it was your most boasted measure, and my hon. Friend might just as well have rested his Amendment upon any other Bill introduced during the last twelve years. Your Land Policy, we have been told, was the great arrow in your quiver. It has failed. Your next great measure is now going to be produced. I do not know what is going to happen to that; but I am quite sure that as every Bill you have produced has been a failure, that a Bill which now has the secret antipathy of every Member of the Conservative

Party for Ireland, and which you were not able to get your Conservative Association at Birmingham the other day to pass a vote in favour of, I am quite sure that that Bill may be pronounced a failure in advance. I think when we have the works and failures of the Tory Party at the present moment to attack, we have our hands full enough without having to consider the shortcomings of a Bill of a Party not yet in office. On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is our duty to challenge the existing Administration, and deal with the next Administration according to its works. That is the policy which our Party intends to push forward. It is the policy that engaged our united support for many years, and I believe that when our work is done, or when our time comes for judgment—that, after all, must be the judgment of the country—I believe it will be found that that policy will yet produce great and salutary good for our country.

(11.35) MR. C. W. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Newington, W.): We Unionists are always asking right hon. Gentlemen opposite to produce their Home Rule Bill. We say in effect, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has said, if you expect to come into Office, say within twelve months, with a vast majority at your back, then you will have to bring in a Home Rule Bill. You will then have to bring in a measure that will be a credit to you as a Government, and which you can recommend to the nation. If you can produce that Bill, then you can produce it now. If you produce it now it will be a credit to you, and it will be an advantage to you at the General Election. On the other hand, if you do not produce the Home Rule Bill now you will lay yourself open to a sort of suspicion that you have no such Bill at all. I venture respectfully and humbly to take a more charitable view of the disposition and conduct of the Opposition whenever there is a difference from the view of the Unionist Party. The Unionist Party assume that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. Gladstone) has an honest and a genuine intention of producing some Bill at some time, but for my own part I do not share that belief. I am under the impression that they have lost

faith in Home Rule as completely as others have. It was once said of Italy that it was merely a geographical expression, and I think it may be said far more truthfully that Home Rule is now but a political expression, about which they talk in Party politics, and in which they affect an interest so long as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian remains a force in public life. But beyond this I think we shall hear very little more of Home Rule from the Opposition Benches. That is my view, and I must, of course, say something in support of the bare statement. That view is, to some extent, supported by the proceedings to-night. We are told by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite that the statesmen who lead in the policy of Home Rule are sure of a vast majority at the General Election, that the people are in favour of Home Rule, that, in fact, the matter is settled. Then in the face of this immediate prospect we have hon. Members coming to the House and putting down Amendments to the Address as though the subject requires ventilation, and information is needed. Now, I think Home Rulers, in taking this action, place themselves very much in the position occupied by "Fair Traders." Three years ago Conservatives, at large gatherings of their Associations, passed resolutions in favour of Fair Trade, and everybody supposed that the whole Party was going to embrace that policy as part of the Conservative creed. But what it has come to is this: an Amendment moved to the Address, on which its authors do not think it desirable to take a Division. What the hon. Member for West Belfast will do remains to be seen to-morrow. There was one part of the hon. Member's speech to which I should like to reply, and that was the threat to the effect that if we did not get rid of Home Rule now we should not be able to get on with our own business. Now, a similar threat was made a long time ago by a Party resembling in many respects the Nationalist Party of to-day—a Party advocating a policy of Repeal. Of the conduct of this Party Sir Robert Peel wrote to the effect that the members of this Party were insensible to the effect of British opinion, and wished to disgust English Members and induce the

belief that legislation would be impossible while Repeal was withheld. Now, that was some sixty years ago, but notwithstanding the obstruction offered to public business anyone may see that from that time to this we have passed legislative measures to the great advantage of the Empire. As threats of obstruction then were overborne by the weight of public opinion and the common sense of most, so we may hope that the obstruction threatened in the future may be equally inoperative. Something has been said, and a good deal might be said, with regard to the present social position of Ireland since the present Government have been in office. I think I may put it in a word, and say that the effect of the rule of my right hon. Friend has shown that the resources of statesmanship are not exhausted, and that a great deal more might have been effected for the good of the Irish people had there not been now in this country, as there were in the days of Burke, persons who would be thoroughly disappointed if the people were ever satisfied. Who they are I need hardly point out. Now, the mention of the hon. Member for West Belfast induced me for a moment to diverge from the line of my remarks. I was saying that I took a more charitable view of the conduct of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite in not producing a Home Rule Bill than did the majority of the Unionist Party. I said that they had lost faith in Home Rule, but I must prove that statement—not leave it resting on a mere allegation of my own. First, I will cite an authority from below the Gangway opposite, the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), who is, I understand, a gentleman deep in the councils of the Nationalist Party, and is or was president or chairman of some association of the Home Rule League. He has thought fit, as a tribute to the memory of his late leader, to publish a biography before the blood was cold in his body. In the course of this, the hon. Gentleman remarked that when he left America in March the cause was lost, and was for the moment dead. It is rather a Hibernian expression, and if a corpse is to be revived, it is only by means of a miracle, and this is not precisely the age for miracles. Now, what does this mean,

*Mr. C. W. Radcliffe Cooke*

that the sacred cause of Home Rule is dead? It means that the Americans and the American-Irish, those whose sympathy has done most to promote the Home Rule agitation, have failed to keep it alive. The subscriptions of these men in America were to the subscriptions in Ireland, to use a well-remembered phrase of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, "as gold is to silver or copper." Then, these men had lost faith in Home Rule, and would finance it no longer. Why? Was it on account of private misconduct on the part of the late Mr. Parnell? One can hardly suppose they would not condone such conduct. Was it because of the ingratitude of the late leader? I think not, for ingratitude in public life is not much regarded. What could it have been then? Well, I think it was in consequence of the extreme folly of deposing a leader on whose single personality, to quote the words of the hon. Member (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), the success of Home Rule almost exclusively depended. When the King of Terrors claimed the Uncrowned King, if he had not been alienated from his party his name would still have been a tower of strength to the movement. As the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Healy), in his declaration of allegiance at Leinster Hall, said, the deposition of the chief would lead to a scramble among Irish patriots who should take his place. Well, the dissensions in the Home Rule camp showed that Home Rule was dead.

(11.57.) MR. McLAREN (Cheshire, Crewe) rose in his place and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

(12.0.) Question put, "That the Question be now put," and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there added."

The House divided :—Ayes 158 ; Noes 179.—(Div. List, No. 2.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, as followeth :—

" Most Gracious Sovereign,

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United King-

Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble to Your Majesty for the gracious which Your Majesty has addressed to Houses of Parliament.

take this first opportunity of offering to Your Majesty our sincere condolence in the dispensation of Providence with our Majesty and this nation have been in the death of His Royal Highness Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and

assure Your Majesty of our heartfelt emotion in the universal feeling of sympathy with Your Majesty and Your family under this grievous affliction the deep sense entertained by all of Your Majesty's subjects of the which the Country has sustained by of a Prince who had won for himself general affection and regard of Majesty's subjects."—(*Mr. Hermon-*

presented by Privy Councillors.

#### SUPPLY.

resolved that this House will, upon Monday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be presented to Her Majesty.—(*Mr. Arthur*

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

resolved that this House will, upon Monday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for supplying the Supply to be granted to the Government.—(*Mr. Arthur Balfour.*)

BANK PRISON BILL. (No. 140.)  
Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

WANCING AND LAW OF PRO-  
DUCT ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.  
(No. 110.) SECOND READING.

On made, and Question proposed,  
that the Bill be now read a second  
time.—(*Mr. T. H. Bolton.*)

T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.):  
We might ask for some explanation.

T. H. BOLTON (St. Pancras, N.):  
A small Bill which obtained a Second  
Reading last Session. There is no  
objection to it, I believe, and I hope the  
House will consent to take the Second  
Reading now.

On agreed to.

Read a second time, and committed  
to a Committee for Tuesday next.

SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS.  
AMENDMENT BILL. (No. 112.)

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

PUBLIC HOUSES (HOURS OF  
CLOSING) (SCOTLAND) BILL. (No. 92.)

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading:  
deferred from To-morrow till Friday.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

SIR W. HARCOURT (Derby): May  
I ask the Government what will be the  
business to-morrow?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREA-  
SURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester,  
E.): To-morrow, as the right hon. Gentle-  
man must be aware, is a private Members'  
night, over which the Government has  
no control.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Does  
the right hon. Gentleman mean to take  
the Irish Local Government Bill on  
Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR assented.

#### MOTIONS.

##### FOOTPATHS' BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Bill for  
the better protection of footpaths and roadside  
wastes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Shaw  
Lefevre, Mr. Bryce, and Sir Walter Foster.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 158.]

##### HOP SUBSTITUTES' BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Brookfield, Bill to provide  
for the declaring of Hop Substitutes in the  
brewing of Beer, ordered to be brought in by  
Mr. Brookfield, Mr. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen,  
Mr. Pomfret, Sir Edmund Lechmere, Mr. Ran-  
kin, and Mr. Channing.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 159.]

##### MINING ACCIDENTS' INSURANCE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baird, Bill to provide for  
a system of National Insurance against Acci-  
dents in Mines in Scotland, ordered to be  
brought in by Mr. Baird, Mr. Vernon, Mr.  
Hugh Elliot, Mr. Hozier, and Mr. Parkes  
Smith.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 160.]

##### INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES REFUSED).

Address for—

"Return of the number of Victuallers'  
Beerhouse and other Licences for the sale of  
Intoxicating Liquors, the renewal of which

has been refused, in the years 1890 and 1891, by the Justices of the Peace in each Licensing District in England and Wales, showing in each case the ground of refusal, especially when such ground was, in any instance, that the Licence was not required; and showing also the result of appeal, if any (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 381, of Session 1890.)"—(*Sir William Harcourt*)

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (SCHOOLS RECEIVING SPECIAL GRANTS).

Order [27th July, 1891] for Return relative thereto, read and discharged; and, instead thereof—

Return ordered—

"By Counties, of the Schools which received during the year ending the 31st day of August, 1891, the Special Grants of £10 or £15 under Articles 104 and 105 of the Code, under the following heads:—Name of School District—Population as returned by Managers:—of School District "within two miles"—Name and denomination of School—Accommodation—Average Attendance—Total Grant (including additional grants)—Additional Grants:—Article 104 (£10 or £15). Article 105 (£10)." (*Mr. Arthur Acland*)

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS (WAGES).

Address for—

"Return of the forms issued by the War Office, Admiralty, Board of Works, and other Departments of the Government, in compliance with the terms of the Resolution of the House of 13th February, 1891."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton*.)

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION).

Ordered, That the Select Committee to consider the best system of providing for the Superannuation of Public Elementary Teachers in England and Wales be re-appointed.—(*Sir Richard Temple*.)

#### GREENWICH HOSPITAL (AGE PENSIONS).

Return ordered—

"Of Copy of Correspondence relating to Greenwich Hospital (Age Pensions), being (1) Letter from the hon. Member for Woolwich to the First Lord of the Admiralty, and (2) Reply to the same with Memorandum."—(*Colonel Hughes*.)

#### AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

Copies presented,—of Returns of the number of Agrarian Outrages reported to the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary during the quarters ended 30th September and 31st December 1891 respectively [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### EVICCTIONS (IRELAND).

Copies presented,—of Returns of the number of Evictions which have come to the knowledge of the Royal Irish Constabulary during the quarters ended 30th September and 31st December 1891 respectively [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 (ORDERS).

Copy presented,—of Order in Council with respect to the importation of Arms and Ammunition [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).

Copy presented,—of the Appropriation Account for 1890-91, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).

Copy presented,—of Appropriation Account of the sums granted by Parliament for the Expense of the Ordnance Factories, &c., for the year ended 31st March 1891 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### NATIONAL DEBT (SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES).

Annual Account presented,—being for the period ending 20th November 1891 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TREASURY CHEST.

Account presented,—for the year 1890-91, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE), 1892.

Copy presented,—of Code of Regulations, with Appendices, of the Scotch Education Department, 1892 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented,—of Diplomatic and Consular Reports on Trade and Finance, No. 982 (Zanzibar) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

House adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 16th February, 1892.

## STANDING COMMITTEE.

A Standing Committee—for the consideration of such Public Bills as may be committed to it by the House—on the Motion of the Chairman of Committees—Appointed.

## COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

On the Motion of the Chairman of Committees—Appointed.

The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:—

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| L. Privy Seal          | L. Balfour,             |
| ( <i>E. Cadogan</i> ), | L. Foxford,             |
| E. Cowper,             | ( <i>E. Limerick</i> ), |
| E. Stanhope,           | L. Colville of Culross, |
| V. Oxenbridge,         | L. Kensington.          |

The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at a quarter past Three o'clock.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 16th February, 1892.

## PRIVATE BUSINESS.

## LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (NEW RAILWAYS) BILL.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, &c.): Upon the London and North Western Railway Bill I desire to say a few words, Sir. I do not know whether this is my opportunity for doing that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Reading stage will afford the hon. Member a better opportunity.

Ordered, That the Order (15th February) that leave be given to bring in the London and North Western Railway (New Railways) Bill be read, and discharged.

Ordered, That in lieu thereof leave be given to bring in "A Bill for empowering the London and North Western Railway Company to construct new and widen existing Railways in the Counties of Warwick and Lancaster, and the West Riding of the County of York, and for conferring powers upon that Company and the Midland Railway Company in relation to some of such Railways, and for other purposes," and that Mr. Plunket, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. MacInnes, and Mr. Albert Bright do prepare and bring in the same.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

poses," and that Mr. Plunket, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. MacInnes, and Mr. Albert Bright do prepare and bring in the same.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

## LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (HEATON LODGE AND WORTLEY RAILWAYS) BILL.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to bring in "A Bill for empowering the London and North Western Railway Company to construct new Railways in the West Riding of the County of York, to be called the Heaton Lodge and Wortley Railways, and for other purposes," and that Mr. Plunket, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. MacInnes, and Mr. Albert Bright do prepare and bring in the same.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

## PARLIAMENT (DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS).

Copy ordered—

"Of Contract, dated the 21st day of December, 1891, between the Controller of the Stationery Office and Reuter's Telegram Company, Limited, for printing and publishing Reports of Debates and Proceedings in Parliament."—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 46.)

## SOLICITORS AND APPRENTICES (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 85.)

Second Reading deferred from Thursday till Thursday 25th February.

## QUESTIONS.

## ACTS OF BRAVERY IN SAVING LIFE AT SEA.

MR. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the many acts of heroism in the saving of human life performed by the crews of lifeboats and fishing smacks on various parts of the coast during the disastrous gales of the present winter; whether, among other notable rescues, his attention has been specially directed to that of the crew of the brig *Content*, of Grimsby, in the North Sea, on Sunday, 13th December, by James Nunn and John Day, the skipper and third hand respectively of the Lowestoft smack *Prima Donna*; and whether, having regard to the exceptional courage and seamanship shown by these men, he will advise

Z

Her Majesty to create an order of a degree corresponding to that of the Victoria Cross, in order to suitably reward such gallant deeds; and whether he will have a record of this and other special acts of bravery of a similar nature prepared and placed within the public reach?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir; my attention has been drawn to many acts of heroism performed by the crews of lifeboats, fishing smacks and others, in saving life at sea during the gales of the present winter. I have approved the grant of medals and other suitable rewards in many instances, and the particular case of rescue to which the hon. Member refers is at the present moment under consideration. So far back as 1866 Her Majesty instituted a decoration (styled the Albert Medal) for rewarding gallantry in saving life at sea. This decoration consists of two classes, and is (like the Victoria Cross) reserved for cases of very exceptional gallantry. It has since its institution been conferred upon 59 persons, among them being the coxswain of a lifeboat and three masters of fishing smacks. Notices of all rewards granted by the Board of Trade are sent to the Press and published in the *Board of Trade Journal*. Each grant of the Albert Medal is, in addition, gazetted with a full account of the services for which it is conferred, and a record of each case is also kept at the Board of Trade, as required by the Warrant creating the decoration. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. Member will agree that it is not necessary for me to suggest to Her Majesty the creation of a new decoration in order to reward cases of gallantry in saving life at sea.

#### THE PATENT OFFICE.

MR. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the statements made by him to the House on the 14th July last, that the estimated surplus from the Patent Office for 1891 was £116,500; that the country ought not to look upon the Patent Office as a permanent source of income; and that it should

be considered whether a reduction might not be made in the fees on patents charged in the interval between four and eight years, so as to extend the cheap protection now given for four years to a longer period: What steps have been taken, or arrangements made, to give effect to those statements, and when the promised reduction will come into operation?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I think the hon. Member has accurately quoted my observations of last year, but the first sentence might give rise to an erroneous impression. The estimate of the large surplus referred to was made without taking into consideration additional expenditure proposed to be incurred by the practical rebuilding of the Patent Office, and accelerating certain publications connected with the Department. I need not say if those matters had been considered the surplus would have been a very different matter. In pursuance of the promise given last Session I considered the matter very carefully last autumn, and placed myself in communication with the Treasury in regard to it. It rests with the Treasury to decide whether the scale of fees should be adopted as recommended by the Board of Trade. I am sorry to say I have not yet been able to come to any definite arrangement with my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore I cannot at the moment state when the reduction of fees will begin; but I hope no long time will elapse before something is done in the matter.

MR. LENG: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if it has been represented to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the reduction of fees would be followed by a large increase in the application for patents, and therefore an increase of revenue; and I would also ask whether, with the expenditure referred to, there would not still be a very considerable surplus left, by which the reduction might be effected?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I do not doubt there would be a surplus, but nothing approaching £116,000. The whole matter is under the consideration of my right hon. Friend.

Mr. Broadhurst

**THE DUTY OF COMMANDING OFFICERS OF VOLUNTEER REGIMENTS.**

**COLONEL MALCOLM (Argyllshire):** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the duty of officers commanding Volunteer regiments to maintain their battalion as near as possible at their authorised numerical strength?

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle):** Undoubtedly it is the duty of a Commanding Officer to use all available means to render the corps he commands as efficient as possible in regard to numbers, as well as in all other respects.

**POST OFFICE SUBSIDIES TO IRISH RAILWAYS.**

**MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.):** I beg to ask the Postmaster General would he have any difficulty in giving a Return showing the subsidies paid by the Post Office Department to the different Irish Railways, the mileage run in each case, the nature of the service afforded, and the populations and valuations of the various towns and districts served by each Company subsidised?

**\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.):** The payments made to Irish Railway Companies for the conveyance of mails will be found on page 92 of the last Estimates for Revenue Departments. The contracts with the principal Railway Companies include the running of one or more mail trains, the speed of which is settled by agreement with the Post Office, and also the right to send bags of mails by other trains. To give a Return of the total mileage so run by such trains would be difficult, and as a Department we do not possess information as to the populations and valuations of the towns and districts served by the Companies.

**MR. T. M. HEALY:** May I ask the right hon. Gentleman will he give us a few of the particulars, say, the sums allowed to each of the four Provinces—to the Great Western, the Midland, the Great Southern and Western, and the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Companies. If he will give us the

amount paid for each, then we will figure out the mileage and populations for ourselves?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** Of course, the railways run through more than one Province; and there are the rates of speed and various considerations to be taken into account. I do not see my way to giving such a Return.

**MR. T. M. HEALY:** The right hon. Gentleman knows what we require, he knows the object with which we ask for the Return. We want to see whether the Counties of Wicklow and Wexford could not be better served. I shall put a further question, and shall continue questions on the subject.

**COLONISATION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.**

**MR. LODER (Brighton):** I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any agreement has yet been arrived at with the Government of British Columbia in respect of the scheme of colonisation recommended by the Select Committee on Colonisation which sat last Session; and whether Her Majesty's Government contemplate bringing in a Bill to carry it into effect?

**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square):** The arrangements to which my hon. Friend alludes, and which Her Majesty's Government are prepared to carry out, were communicated to the Representatives of British Columbia on 10th June last, but no reply has, up to the present, been received.

**TELEGRAPHIC STATIONS, COUNTY GALWAY.**

**MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.):** I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is prepared to establish telegraphic stations in the villages of Mountshanon and Whitegate, County Galway; and whether he can establish direct postal communication between Woodford and Whitegate, considering that the additional cost would be so small, as a rural messenger runs daily half the journey between these two centres?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** Inquiry was made in 1884 and 1885 as to the



feasibility of establishing telegraph offices at Mountshanon and Whitegate, but it appeared that the expense would be very considerable, and that, on the other hand, the revenue would be insignificant. I shall, however, be glad to have further inquiry made, and to let the hon. Member know the result. As regards direct postal communication between Woodford and Whitegate, applications have been several times considered, but it has always been found that the necessary expense would be quite disproportionate to the postal advantage to be secured.

#### SCOTTISH PIER AND HARBOUR WORKS.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, in the printed form of agreement to be signed by a contractor, for the construction of Scottish piers and other works, under "The Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Act, 1891," there are clauses to the effect (Clauses 7 and 8) that arbitration (if necessary) is to be conducted under the English Arbitration Act of 1889, and that agreements are to be interpreted and disputes decided by the Law of England, and the contractors are obliged to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the High Court of Justice in England; whether this form of agreement is issued under the authority of the Board of Trade; whether it is with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government that this new extension of the jurisdiction of the English Courts in Scotland is being introduced, and Scotchmen, who tender for works to be done in Scotland, are asked as a condition of their tender being accepted to forgo their right of being tried in their own country and by their own Laws; and whether the Board of Trade will take care that no similar clauses are inserted in the conditions of tender for works in Scotland in future?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: No particular form of agreement is authorised or even mentioned in the Pier and Harbour Orders made by the Board of Trade and confirmed by the Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Act, 1891. I am not aware of,

*Sir James Fergusson*

and consequently have not authorised the form to which the hon. Member refers; and I can only surmise that it is a matter between the undertakers of the Order and their contractor, with which the Board of Trade have nothing whatever to do.

MR. BUCHANAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that in future contracts undertaken with the approval of the engineers of the Board of Trade such supervision shall be exercised that no such clause shall be inserted?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I do not think I have the power to do that. I think it is a matter between the undertakers of the piers and their contractors.

MR. BUCHANAN: I will endeavour to put a further question on the subject, failing a satisfactory answer to which I shall be obliged to call attention to the subject in another manner.

#### STATIONERY OFFICE CONTRACTORS' CIRCULAR.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Circular which is being sent by the Stationery Office to all contractors?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): The question was practically answered yesterday, when I said I would lay on the Table a Return giving the information.

#### THE GLASGOW AND EDINBURGH POST OFFICES.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether it is true, as stated in the Scottish newspapers, that it has been determined to place the Glasgow Post Office under the control of the Edinburgh Post Office establishment, in many matters concerning which Glasgow has for years past communicated direct with London; whether he is aware that the system of direct communication with London was adopted in consequence of numerous complaints as to the delay occasioned by the reference to Edinburgh of questions which had to be decided in London; and if he

would be so good as to explain the exact nature of any changes proposed?

SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN (Glasgow, Bridgeton) had also notice of the following question: To ask the Postmaster General whether any steps have been taken towards carrying on the postal administration of Glasgow through the postal authorities of Edinburgh; and, if so, what is the character and scope of the change?

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox), on the same subject, had notice to ask the Postmaster General whether any arrangement has recently been made for subordinating business transacted at Glasgow Post Office to the Post Office staff at Edinburgh; if so, the nature and extent of the new arrangement, and the reasons for making the same?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I will answer the group of questions on this subject together with a question of which I have had private notice from the hon. Member for the Central Division of Glasgow (Mr. Baird). I am aware of the feeling which prompts these Questions, especially as I belong myself to the West of Scotland; but there is a certain misapprehension involved. It is intended that for all postal, that is public purposes, the Glasgow Post Office shall remain as heretofore. The Postmaster will still be Surveyor of the Glasgow District as well as Postmaster of Glasgow, and there will be no diminution of his powers. The only change that has been made is one affecting internal administration, in which the public have no concern. For example, any question regarding accounts has of late been referred from Glasgow to London, from London to Edinburgh, where the accounts for Scotland are kept, back to London, and again back to Glasgow. By sending such questions to the Surveyor General for Scotland, and, if necessary, through him to London, there will be simplification and greater despatch. Moreover, as between Glasgow and London, owing to the Postmaster being also Surveyor, there will be one stage less than at other places in Scotland.

#### LORD ASHBROOK'S ESTATE, KING'S COUNTY.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Lord Ashbrook's tenants have repeatedly offered to accept any fair or reasonable terms, he will refuse to lend the forces of the Crown to assist Lord Ashbrook to carry out evictions on that portion of his estate near Shannon Bridge, in the King's County?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. W. L. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): No, Sir; I can give no such undertaking as the hon. Member asks. The protection of the police must be given to those who have a right to it, if it be asked.

#### SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether any steps have been taken to carry out the successful design for the completion of the South Kensington Museum?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (MR. PLUNKET, Dublin University): During the Autumn Mr. Aston Webb, the successful architect, has been at work on the plans, making such alterations in the details of arrangements as have been suggested by the Science and Art Department and the Office of Works. Some time will be required for completion of working drawings, and for certain preliminary works necessary to clear the site, and to provide for the work of the Science and Art Department proceeding without interruption during the progress of the works, and in these circumstances it is not proposed to do more this year than carry out these preliminary works.

#### LIGHTING THE LIBRARY.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether one of the rooms in the Library can be lighted with candles?

MR. PLUNKET: In reply to my hon. Friend, I may say there are lamps in the rooms if hon. Members choose to have them lighted.

MR. BARTLEY: I am quite aware of that; but what I mean is, will the electric light be removed from one of

the rooms? The glare from this light is so intense that many Members cannot stand it?

MR. PLUNKET: I am afraid there will not be universal assent to that.

#### THE SPECIAL COMMISSIONERSHIP FOR INCOME TAX.

MR. BARTLEY: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the vacant Special Commissionership for Income Tax has yet been filled up; and, if so, who has been appointed?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EX-CHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The vacancy was caused by the retirement of Mr. Daniel O'Connell. My right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury has appointed in his place Mr. Walter Gyles, a member of the Irish Bar.

#### STREET BETTING IN BELFAST.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the street betting which goes on in Belfast apparently unchecked by the police, and whether he will take steps to insure greater vigilance in its suppression?

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): As I am Member for the City of Belfast, which the hon. and gallant Member is not, and as the question contains a serious allegation against the police and the habits of the population of Belfast, perhaps I may be allowed to ask if the Government are in possession of any specific information that Belfast differs in this respect from any other great city?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): My attention has only been called to this matter by the Question being put on the Paper. I have referred the matter to the police for their Report. In answer to the hon. Member opposite, I may say that up to the present no Report on the subject from the police has reached me.

#### THE PROCURATOR FISCAL, ROSS AND CROMARTY.

DR. M'DONALD (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in appointing a gentleman

*Mr. Bartley*

for the now vacant Procurator Fiscalship for the Western District of Ross and Cromarty, he will take care that the gentleman appointed shall be able to speak the Gaelic language, and also shall, according to repeated promises from his predecessors, be prohibited from holding other offices in conjunction with his fiscalship; and whether such a stipulation has been carried out in the case of the Fiscal recently appointed for Lewis; and, if not, will he explain on what grounds?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I cannot give any undertaking that a knowledge of the Gaelic language will be regarded as essential in appointing to the vacant office referred to, as there are, in my opinion, other qualifications of more importance. I am not aware of any promises made by my predecessor in regard to such appointments; but on several occasions, and once in answer to the hon. Member, it was stated that the question of restricting the holders from private practice is always considered, and in recent cases they have been so restricted. While this restriction is imposed it is usual to insert in the Commission liberty to hold such offices of a public nature as the Sheriff may approve, and this was done in the case referred to in the latter part of the question.

#### THE JUSTICES OF DRONFIELD AND MR. HARRISON.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the action of the Justices of Dronfield, in Derbyshire, in dismissing a summons against certain gamekeepers of the Duke of Rutland, obtained by Mr. Harrison, although it was admitted that these gamekeepers had hindered that gentleman from walking along a high road on a moor, on the ground that a grouse drive was proceeding, and that, on his refusing to withdraw, he was held back by three of the gamekeepers for 18 minutes; whether his attention has been also called to the fact that three policemen were present during this assault, and refused to give Mr. Harrison any pro-

tection, or to interfere with the action of the gamekeepers; whether he is aware that the defence of these gamekeepers, submitted by their solicitor to the Justices, was that it was a barefaced attempt on the part of Mr. Harrison to interfere with the legitimate sport of gentlemen, and that the summons ought to be dismissed in order to show complainant that he could not be permitted to behave in a manner which had become intolerable; and what action he proposes to take in the matter?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): I have received a Report of the case referred to by the hon. Member. This Report contains several particulars not mentioned in the Question. The events occurred on 8th October, and the summons was taken out on 2nd November. The summons having been heard, the magistrates dismissed it, solely on the ground that the assault complained of was of a slight and trifling nature, and came within Section 16 of "The Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879." An application to the High Court for a *mandamus* was refused on 13th January. I am informed that the complainant has now commenced an action for damages against the gamekeepers; and, under these circumstances, it would be improper for me to express an opinion or to take action in the matter until the litigation has closed.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is intended to take any action in this matter in regard to the policemen who witnessed this "trifling assault" for some twenty minutes?

\*MR. MATTHEWS: From the Report supplied to me there appears to be some doubt as to the nature of the alleged assault; and until that doubt is cleared up by further inquiry, I do not propose to take any action.

#### HOURS OF RAILWAY SERVANTS.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Board of Trade have, since last Session, ordered any further Returns of the hours of railway servants, which would show

whether the Railway Companies have made any substantial changes in the hours of duty since December, 1890?

\*MR. MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I quite agree with the suggestion contained in the Question, that we ought to obtain some later information in the form supplied for 1890. I believe the changes have been considerable. I have not yet been able to settle the precise month which should be taken. Of course, I desire to take as late a month as possible, so that we may have the most recent information. I hope the Return may be ordered in a few days.

#### THE COINAGE ACT, 1891.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any steps have been taken to carry out the provisions of "The Coinage Act, 1891"?

MR. GOSCHEN: An Order in Council for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act is now ready, and will be submitted for approval at the next Council. We shall then be prepared to proceed at once with the issue of a Proclamation to announce that light gold will be received at the Bank of England. The sum of £400,000 has been issued and invested in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

#### THE IRISH AND SCOTCH EDUCATION GRANTS.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, looking at the urgency of the Irish Education Bill, which should be disposed of at the end of the financial year, now at six weeks' distance, he will cause this Bill to be brought in after the introductory stage of the Irish Local Government Bill is disposed of on Thursday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am afraid it will be impossible to dispose of the Bill before the end of the financial year. At one time I did hope it would be possible; but, considering the amount of business to be got through, I cannot hold out any hope that, even if the Bill were brought in at once, we could pass it within the time, having in view the very important questions

raised by the Bill. As the House knows, it does not merely deal with the question of assisted education, but with other questions, such as a modified form of compulsion, and its provisions cannot be expected to pass without a certain amount of discussion. The money with which the Bill deals will partly accrue during the coming year, and will, in part, be money which has accrued in the current year. Proposals will be made for dealing with the money of the current year up to the end of March, and a Supplementary Estimate will be presented in time for the money to be disposed of. The Bill dealing with the general, the permanent allocation of the funds, will be brought forward at a later date.

MR. SEXTON: How soon may we expect to have the Bill in our hands?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is quite right in seeking early information as to the Bill. It will require consideration in Ireland from all interested in education on every side of this much controverted subject. I hope it may be in the hands of Members in the course, say, of ten days at latest. Of course, if hon. Members would be willing to abstain from a First Reading discussion, it could be distributed in a very few days.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Is it contemplated to make any statement on introducing the Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will leave my right hon. Friend to answer that. He is not, at the moment, in the House.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): Will the same plan be adopted in regard to the Scotch money—two items, two portions?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The two cases are different, the Scotch Bill is shorter and, I think, much less controversial; so I hope we may dispose of it within the financial year.

MR. SEXTON: May we hope that the Supplementary Estimate will be circulated in such time as will allow full consideration of the proposals before the Vote is taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly.

#### NEW MEMBER SWORN.

John Archibald Willcox, esquire, for Liverpool (Everton Division.)

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

## MOTIONS.

### FOOTPATHS PRESERVATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jesse Collings, Bill for the Preservation of Footpaths, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Cust, and Mr. Story-Maskelyne.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 161.]

### TRADE UNION PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howell, Bill to exempt the Funds of Trade Unions paying provident benefits to their members from the payment of Income Tax on their investments, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Howell, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. John Wilson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 162.]

### CRIMINAL CASES APPEALS BILL.

On Motion of Sir Henry James, Bill to establish a Court of Appeal in Criminal Cases, ordered to be brought in by Sir Henry James, Mr. Asquith, and Sir Albert Rollit.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 163.]

### FIRE INQUESTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Brookfield, Bill to provide for the holding of Fire Inquests, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Brookfield, Mr. Noble, Mr. Gainsford Bruce, and Mr. Octavius V. Morgan.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 164.]

### LOCAL COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. McCartan, Bill to amend the Law relating to Local Courts of Bankruptcy in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. McCartan, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Maurice Healy, and Mr. Knox.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 165.]

### RANGES ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Bill to amend "The Ranges Act, 1891," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Compton, Sir Walter Foster, and Mr. Hoare.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 166.]

### BEER ADULTERATION (No. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Quilter, Bill for better securing the purity of beer, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Quilter, Mr. Heneage, Viscount Wolmer, Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. Gurdon, Colonel Anstruther, and Mr. Llewellyn.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 167.]

### SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to amend "The Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875."

ordered to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Channing, Mr. Provand, Dr. Farquharson, and Mr. Thomas Dickson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 168.]

#### HOURS OF RAILWAY SERVANTS.

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Select Committee be re-appointed to inquire whether, and, if so, in what way, the Hours worked by Railway Servants should be restricted by legislation.

That the Committee do consist of Twenty-six Members."

\*MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I do not rise in any way to oppose the re-appointment of the Committee, but I should like to ask the President of the Board of Trade as to when we may expect the labours of the Committee to be brought to a conclusion. This Committee was appointed after a very interesting discussion on a Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Channing). The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion declared that he meant business, and a little later in the evening the late Mr. W. H. Smith emphatically endorsed the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman, and said the fact that there had been overtime was the basis of the appointment of the Committee. Now, on the 3rd of February, when I ventured to put down a somewhat limited Amendment to the Resolution the right hon. Gentleman pointed out certain consequences that would flow from it and asked me to withdraw it, which I did after a very emphatic declaration that he accepted the situation as disclosed in the Reports of the Inspectors. The hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt), a gentleman of much experience and the Chairman of one of the great Railway Companies, went so far as to say that the Committee would close their labours in a week or two. But the Committee, which consisted of 26 Members—a rather unworkable number—have had a large number of sittings; they have already examined some 30 witnesses, and asked no fewer than 10,000 questions, and the appeal I would make to the right hon. Gentleman is that he will, in so far as in him lies, undertake to do what he undertook to do last year, namely, to get the Committee to move at a reasonably

rapid pace, so that we may have its Report as soon as possible. This is an extremely important matter to railway servants throughout the United Kingdom. No one reading the very large Blue Book will contend that some of the questions asked have not been a little wide of the actual scope of the Committee as defined in the Resolution of the 23rd January last year. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to assure us that we may entertain something like hope of a result this Session.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I desire to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade the state of the representation of Irish Members sitting on this side of the House on this Committee. The Irish Members form practically one-sixth of the House, and yet on this Committee which numbers 26 there are only two Irish Members. I think we are entitled to a larger representation. My hon. Friend the Member for South Donegal (Mr. Swift Mac Neill) has not been very well able to attend this Committee, but his name is put down again without his being asked as to whether he can give the necessary attention to a matter of this importance. At the present time there is a very keen anxiety among railway servants in Ireland, where there have already been two unpleasant strikes in reference to this matter, which it is very desirable should be quickly settled. The case of Ireland differs from that of England or Scotland, and I think that they should have a little more attention and a stronger representation on the Committee.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): With regard to the point raised by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, he will recollect that the Select Committee was originally appointed after the usual practice by arrangement between the representatives of all sections of the House. When the appointment came to be discussed, it was objected that the labour interest was not sufficiently represented. Two hon. Members were thereupon added to the Committee, and no doubt that did leave the Irish representation rather smaller than perhaps it might otherwise have been. Of

course, there is no objection whatever to the discharge of the Member for South Donegal if he is unable to attend, and the substitution of another Member. I hope, however, the House will not alter the constitution of the Committee, which was only arrived at after very considerable debate, and also because the Committee has already listened to a vast amount of evidence. No one can be more disappointed than I was at the Committee being unable to report last Session. The Members of the Committee will bear me out that the Committee were unanimous in considering it to be impossible to arrive at a Report last Session, and in recommending their re-appointment this year. With regard to our proceedings this year, I can assure the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division that so far as I am concerned I shall desire that they should be as expeditious as possible, and I do not think there can be any reason to doubt that we shall be able to arrive at a decision before the close of the present Session.

(4.13.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I should like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that since the appointment of this Committee the labour question has undergone enormous development. The railway servants of Belfast are desirous that their case should be heard, and it is, therefore, desirable that there should be a larger Irish representation on the Committee. I hope, therefore, that two Members will be added.

(4.15.) MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I should like to associate myself with the claim of the Irish Members for a larger representation on this Committee. The question, which engages the attention and excites the interest of the people of Ireland, ought to be considered by a Committee consisting of a larger number of Irish Members. The hon. Gentleman has asked that two Members be added. I think one might suffice, making three in all. No difficulty need arise in deciding upon the name of the additional Member. We desire that the interests of Irish railway servants should be considered by a Committee, on which they are properly represented.

*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*

MR. SEXTON: It will simplify matters if I accept the suggestion of the hon. Member.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I think the interests of the Irish railway labourers would be fully considered by the Committee as it stands; but I must protest against the idea of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Healy), that, we sitting on this side of the House do not take as keen an interest as Gentlemen sitting opposite in Irish railway servants.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I did not mean to say that the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not have the interests of the railway servant at heart.

(4.20.) MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I concur absolutely in the remarks of the President of the Board of Trade. I think it is most desirable to bring this inquiry to as speedy a conclusion as possible. I venture to suggest that the Motion should be postponed for a day or two, in order to see if the views of the Irish Members cannot be met without an inconvenient and undesirable increase of the Members of the Committee.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to move the omission of the words "Twenty-six" and the insertion of the words "Twenty-seven."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "Twenty-six," and insert the words "Twenty-seven."—(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir M. HICKS BEACH): I should hope the hon. Gentleman would not press that Motion. I have no personal objection to the increase of the Committee, but it would be difficult to increase it without disturbing the balance of opinion. I would hope that the House might be disposed to appoint this Committee now, and that there might be communications in the usual way with the view of meeting the wishes of hon. Members from Ireland without any increase of the numbers of the Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Ordered, That the following be Members of the Committee:—Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Mr. Channing, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Mr. Crawford, Baron de Worms, Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy,

Mr. Herbert Gl..., Mr. Heneage, Mr. Howorth, Mr. M..., Mr. Mac Neill, Mr. Walter M'Laren, ..., Maguire, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. M..., Mr. Muntz, Mr. Murdoch, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. Pickard, Sir Edward Reed, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Somervell, Sir George Trevelyan, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Vernon, and Mr. John Wilson.

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

That Five be the quorum.—(Mr. Akers Douglas.)

#### EAST INDIA—CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

(4.24.) MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I rise to move an Address for—

"Return of all Appointments (excluding covenanted Civil Servants only) in all Departments of all the Civil Services, of monthly salaries of Rs. 400 and upwards, stating separately the number employed for each separate amount, and distinguishing Natives pure, and Europeans and Eurasians."

My reason for moving for this Return is to obtain materials for the settlement of a controversy that has arisen between the Secretary of State for India and myself. The Under Secretary has been good enough to send me a letter in which he says he does not see how the Government of India can accede to my Motion, as all the information I ask was given in a Return moved for by the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn last year, which Return is in the same form, but limited to those with salaries of 1,000 rupees per month.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. GEORGE CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I beg the hon. Member's pardon; I said, and I meant, 1,000 rupees per annum.

MR. MAC NEILL: My Motion is for a Return of Civil Servants whose monthly salaries amount to 400 rupees and upwards, and I fixed this sum in order to show how, from all the higher branches of the Civil Service of India, natives are excluded. Two years ago in this House I made, in the presence of the then Under Secretary, Sir John Gorst, the same statements as I made the other night to which the present Under Secretary takes objection. My statements two years ago were not contradicted by the singularly astute gentleman who then represented the India Office.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will be

kind enough not to assume that I admitted everything said in this House about Indian affairs that I did not expressly contradict.

MR. MACNEILL: The right hon. Gentleman goes on the good old legal maxim of admitting nothing, but if he could have contradicted me he would have done so. I hold in my hand the 14th Annual Report of the Indian National Congress, and I should just like to read a passage to the House—

Mr. Eardley Norton said:—"I like to believe that they not merely make, but redeem, their promises. It pains me when I see them lack the courage of their convictions. Let me call one more witness to the point. He shall be a former Viceroy. I will examine Lord Lytton. I should be afraid to use his language as my own, lest I should be indicted for high treason. But a Viceroy can do no wrong. Lord Lytton, in a secret Report, which accidentally came to light, in terms told the authorities in England that the people of this country had been 'cheated'—I am quoting, gentlemen—of their hopes. So much for the manner and extent of England's redemption of her vows. I wish to touch with brief particularity upon two points in connection with the Public Service Commission. First, as to the excessive cost of the administration of this country. Many people think it ruinous. I agree with them. The only real solution of the difficulty lies in an infusion into the machinery of the country of a large, and yearly larger, element of indigenous Indian talent. What share do you hold to-day in the service of your country? Here are some suggestive figures. Out of 2,357 appointments in the higher Uncovenanted Civil Service you, gentlemen of India, hold 188. The non-domiciled Europeans appropriate 1,460 such appointments, the domiciled Europeans 486, Eurasians 223, and the Indians 188. The three first bodies hold 2,169 berths, you only 188.

Mr. Eardley Norton quoted from a little book entitled *Civil Service Reform*, written by a native gentleman, which also supports my contention. What I have stated here was said in India four years ago, and in this House two years ago, and accepted as indisputably correct. I am very happy to have had an opportunity of bringing these facts before the public notice, and, surely, if the case of the hon. Gentleman is right, and India is, as Lord Northbrook said it ought to be, held not for the benefit of the British middle class, which starved and robbed the Indian people, it will be easy for him to stultify me by giving the Return I ask for. Indian affairs should be entirely severed from Party politics, and it is our duty to economise



course, there is no objection whatever to the discharge of the Member for South Donegal if he is unable to attend, and the substitution of another Member. I hope, however, the House will not alter the constitution of the Committee, which was only arrived at after very considerable debate, and also because the Committee has already listened to a vast amount of evidence. No one can be more disappointed than I was at the Committee being unable to report last Session. The Members of the Committee will bear me out that the Committee were unanimous in considering it to be impossible to arrive at a Report last Session, and in recommending their re-appointment this year. With regard to our proceedings this year, I can assure the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division that so far as I am concerned I shall desire that they should be as expeditious as possible, and I do not think there can be any reason to doubt that we shall be able to arrive at a decision before the close of the present Session.

(4.13.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I should like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that since the appointment of this Committee the labour question has undergone enormous development. The railway servants of Belfast are desirous that their case should be heard, and it is, therefore, desirable that there should be a larger Irish representation on the Committee. I hope, therefore, that two Members will be added.

(4.15.) MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I should like to associate myself with the claim of the Irish Members for a larger representation on this Committee. The question, which engages the attention and excites the interest of the people of Ireland, ought to be considered by a Committee consisting of a larger number of Irish Members. The hon. Gentleman has asked that two Members be added. I think one might suffice, making three in all. No difficulty need arise in deciding upon the name of the additional Member. We desire that the interests of Irish railway servants should be considered by a Committee, on which they are properly represented.

*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*

MR. SEXTON: It will simplify matters if I accept the suggestion of the hon. Member.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I think the interests of the Irish railway labourers would be fully considered by the Committee as it stands; but I must protest against the idea of the hon. Member for North Longford (Mr. Healy), that, we sitting on this side of the House do not take as keen an interest as Gentlemen sitting opposite in Irish railway servants.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I did not mean to say that the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not have the interests of the railway servant at heart.

(4.20.) MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I concur absolutely in the remarks of the President of the Board of Trade. I think it is most desirable to bring this inquiry to as speedy a conclusion as possible. I venture to suggest that the Motion should be postponed for a day or two, in order to see if the views of the Irish Members cannot be met without an inconvenient and undesirable increase of the Members of the Committee.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to move the omission of the words "Twenty-six" and the insertion of the words "Twenty-seven."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "Twenty-six," and insert the words "Twenty-seven."—(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir M. HICKS BEACH): I should hope the hon. Gentleman would not press that Motion. I have no personal objection to the increase of the Committee, but it would be difficult to increase it without disturbing the balance of opinion. I would hope that the House might be disposed to appoint this Committee now, and that there might be communications in the usual way with the view of meeting the wishes of hon. Members from Ireland without any increase of the numbers of the Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Ordered, That the following be Members of the Committee:—Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Mr. Channing, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Mr. Crawford, Baron de Worms, Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy,

Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Mr. Heneage, Mr. Howorth, Mr. MacInnes, Mr. Mac Neill, Mr. Walter McLaren, Mr. Maguire, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Milvain, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Murdoch, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. Pickard, Sir Edward Reed, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Somervell, Sir George Trevelyan, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Vernon, and Mr. John Wilson.

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers Douglas.*)

#### EAST INDIA—CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

(4.24.) MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I rise to move an Address for—

“Return of all Appointments (excluding covenanted Civil Servants only) in all Departments of all the Civil Services, of monthly salaries of Rs. 400 and upwards, stating separately the number employed for each separate amount, and distinguishing Natives pure, and Europeans and Eurasians.”

My reason for moving for this Return is to obtain materials for the settlement of a controversy that has arisen between the Secretary of State for India and myself. The Under Secretary has been good enough to send me a letter in which he says he does not see how the Government of India can accede to my Motion, as all the information I ask was given in a Return moved for by the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn last year, which Return is in the same form, but limited to those with salaries of 1,000 rupees per month.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. GEORGE CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I beg the hon. Member's pardon; I said, and I meant, 1,000 rupees per annum.

MR. MAC NEILL: My Motion is for a Return of Civil Servants whose monthly salaries amount to 400 rupees and upwards, and I fixed this sum in order to show how, from all the higher branches of the Civil Service of India, natives are excluded. Two years ago in this House I made, in the presence of the then Under Secretary, Sir John Gorst, the same statements as I made the other night to which the present Under Secretary takes objection. My statements two years ago were not contradicted by the singularly astute gentleman who then represented the India Office.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will be

kind enough not to assume that I admitted everything said in this House about Indian affairs that I did not expressly contradict.

MR. MAC NEILL: The right hon. Gentleman goes on the good old legal maxim of admitting nothing, but if he could have contradicted me he would have done so. I hold in my hand the 14th Annual Report of the Indian National Congress, and I should just like to read a passage to the House—

Mr. Eardley Norton said:—“I like to believe that they not merely make, but redeem, their promises. It pains me when I see them lack the courage of their convictions. Let me call one more witness to the point. He shall be a former Viceroy. I will examine Lord Lytton. I should be afraid to use his language as my own, lest I should be indicted for high treason. But a Viceroy can do no wrong. Lord Lytton, in a secret Report, which accidentally came to light, in terms told the authorities in England that the people of this country had been ‘cheated’—I am quoting, gentlemen—of their hopes. So much for the manner and extent of England's redemption of her vows. I wish to touch with brief particularity upon two points in connection with the Public Service Commission. First, as to the excessive cost of the administration of this country. Many people think it ruinous. I agree with them. The only real solution of the difficulty lies in an infusion into the machinery of the country of a large, and yearly larger, element of indigenous Indian talent. What share do you hold to-day in the service of your country? Here are some suggestive figures. Out of 2,357 appointments in the higher Uncovenanted Civil Service you, gentlemen of India, hold 188. The non-domiciled Europeans appropriate 1,460 such appointments, the domiciled Europeans 486, Eurasians 223, and the Indians 188. The three first bodies hold 2,169 berths, you only 188.

Mr. Eardley Norton quoted from a little book entitled *Civil Service Reform*, written by a native gentleman, which also supports my contention. What I have stated here was said in India four years ago, and in this House two years ago, and accepted as indisputably correct. I am very happy to have had an opportunity of bringing these facts before the public notice, and, surely, if the case of the hon. Gentleman is right, and India is, as Lord Northbrook said it ought to be, held not for the benefit of the British middle class, which starved and robbed the Indian people, it will be easy for him to stultify me by giving the Return I ask for. Indian affairs should be entirely severed from Party politics, and it is our duty to economise

the administration of it, as well as to give the Indians some share in the management of their own affairs. It is ridiculous to say that when 280,000,000 of people are under our rule, they are all to be excluded from the honourable ambition of assisting in the government of their country.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will give directions that there be laid before this House a Return of all Appointments (excluding covenanted Civil Servants only) in all Departments of all the Civil Services, of monthly salaries of Rs.400 and upwards, stating separately the number employed for each separate amount, and distinguishing Natives pure, and Europeans and Eurasians."

—(*Mr. Mac Neill.*)

\*(4.40.) MR. CURZON: There are parts of the hon. Gentleman's speech, particularly its declamatory and denunciatory parts, which I think it is unnecessary for me to allude to, and there are only two matters of any importance which I need mention. The first is the Return moved for by the hon. Member, and the second is the alleged discrepancy between the figures quoted by him and other figures quoted by myself in this discussion. On the first point I have already informed the hon. Member in a private letter that it is not necessary to give the Return, for the reason that all the information which he requires, and a great deal besides, will be contained in the Return moved for by the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn last year, and granted by the Government, the information for which is now being collected in India, and which will be no doubt shortly laid upon the Table. The Return the hon. Member wants is for monthly salaries of Rs.400 and upwards; but our Return gives yearly salaries of Rs.1,000 and upwards, and, therefore, every single item that he desires will appear in that Return.

MR. MAC NEILL: Will the hon. Gentleman in the Return specify the graduated salaries? My point is, that that Return does not show the salaries of the higher Civil Service, and I want to get at the number of natives in the higher Civil Service.

\*MR. CURZON: I do not know that there will be any objection to give the

information that the hon. Member desires, although I cannot pledge myself to do so; but from the Return granted last year he really will obtain all the information that he wants, although possibly it may not be arranged in the way in which, for his own purposes, he would like it to be. As to the alleged discrepancy of figures, what are the facts of the case? The hon. Gentleman addressed the House complaining that he had been treated with great unfairness and discourtesy. There was nothing of the kind. He has been treated with perfect fairness, as I will explain. The other evening I alluded to the officers of the higher branches of the Uncovenanted Service, excluding the Special Departments, and gave certain figures. I quoted from the Blue Book figures which are opposed to those quoted by the hon. Member. He gave no authority for his statement at the time he made it, but yesterday he came down to the House and explained that his authority was the very Blue Book from which I had been quoting. I have spent some time this morning in searching through it, and I have not yet discovered the figures to which he alludes; but he has done me the courtesy to explain that those figures are to be arrived at by selecting different items in the Blue Book, and producing the result he has described. I submit to the House that it is possible, by taking a table here and there, and making a classification to suit your case, to produce any result you please. The hon. Member has entirely ignored the executive and judicial branches of the Service.

MR. MAC NEILL: I beg pardon; I mentioned them.

\*MR. CURZON: The hon. Gentleman has entirely ignored them in his figures, based upon a calculation for which he quotes the authority of the Indian Congress. I do not desire to dispute the authority of that Congress, but it is perfectly possible to select particular branches of the Public Service, in which technical skill is required, and in which there must be more Englishmen than natives, and that is what he has done. Having selected his figures, he comes down and makes a speech, giving the House

*Mr. Mac Neill*

to understand that the figures he puts before us are typical of the whole case. But I submit that that is not a fair method of argument, or a fair conclusion to invite us to come to. I should not object to the publication of any facts or figures giving the whole state of the case at the present time, and the actual number of Englishmen compared with natives employed in India, because I believe that such a Return would convey light to the hon. Gentleman's mind, as he has no idea of the manner in which natives are most wisely employed at the present time.

Question put, and negatived.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL.

(NO. 118.) SECOND READING.

(4.50.) Order for Second Reading read.

\*MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devon, Ashburton): This Bill is intended to deal with a grievance which has been felt for a long time—namely, the method of appointing Justices of the Peace in this country. The purpose of my Bill is: in the first place, to give County and Municipal Councils power to appoint a certain number of Justices of the Peace, in proportion to the inhabitants; in the second place, my Bill provides that Chairmen of Boards of Guardians and Urban Sanitary Authorities shall be Justices of the Peace on the same principle that Mayors of towns are Justices, and that Aldermen in some cities, also elected, are Justices of the Peace; thirdly, I desire to abolish the property qualification in respect of the Justices so elected; and, fourthly, to provide for the retirement of a large number of gentlemen whose names are now in the Commission, but who have long ceased to do magisterial duty. No one can contend that the present method of nominating Justices of the Peace is in any way satisfactory, for they are nominated by an irresponsible official of the Crown—the Lord Lieutenant in counties, and in boroughs merely by the wire-pullers of the Party which at the time happen to be in office. This, I hold, is contrary to the principles of representa-

tive government. It is unsatisfactory to those who wish to enjoy the dignity of a Justice of the Peace, and it is unsatisfactory to the people at large. This is no new subject, for it was raised in this House as far back as the year 1876 by an hon. Member, in a Resolution, to the effect that the law needed speedy and thorough investigation with a view to its amendment; and the late Mr. John Bright held a very strong opinion of the same kind. I am a Justice of the Peace myself, both for a county and borough, and disclaim any idea of making an attack upon the present Magistrates. Many of them, no doubt, are zealous, conscientious, and thoroughly respected, and I am anxious not to give offence in any way to them; but I can hardly think anyone will contend that there is that confidence amongst the working classes in the administration of justice in our Courts of Petty Sessions which they ought to feel. I do not think that the decisions of the Great Unpaid are universally respected, and my desire is to inspire public confidence in these Petty Sessional Courts by introducing the principle of election. I base my argument on the broad principle that the present principle of nomination is inconsistent with the free and democratic institutions of this country, and is a mere relic of the old days of jobbery and patronage. Our old constitutional principle is that a man should be tried by his Peers, but that is not done in our Courts of Petty Sessions; for men of the working classes are tried by those who are commonly regarded as a superior class, above them, and I do not believe there are half a dozen Justices of the Peace belonging to the working classes in the whole country. The present system has the effect of setting class against class, and favours the exploded idea that it is the special function of owners of property to rule, and the fate of the poor to be ruled. There is amongst the people at large a perpetual soreness upon this point which must continue so long as the present system exists, so long as Benches, consisting entirely of men of property, decide questions affecting property, and game preservers are permitted to adjudicate upon cases of breach of the Game Laws. I am no

advocate for electing Judges of the Superior Courts. They require special qualifications, and have to determine questions of law involving rights of property. But in criminal cases they are assisted by a jury. Justices of the Peace discharge the functions of both Judge and jury, and should be selected from all ranks of the people, and by men elected by the people, and in whom they have confidence. I know that many regard our social fabric as a building with its upper and lower floors. I would ask them to remember the Tower of Babel, and what became of it, when the gentlemen in the upper story ceased to understand the men on the ground floor. There is nothing in my Bill which militates against the appointment of paid Magistrates, and I should like to see our Borough and County Councils have power to appoint paid Magistrates for their own districts. I will, however, call attention to some of the evils in connection with the present system. The idea of election is not new, for at the present time elected Mayors are Justices, as are elected Coroners, elected Baillies, and in some boroughs Aldermen and Port-reves. In boroughs our Justices are now elected, but by whom? By the political wire-pullers of the particular Party which happens to be in power at the time. Their names are sent by the wire-pullers to the Lord Lieutenant, and by him forwarded to the Lord Chancellor, who goes through the decent farce of submitting the names to the Town Council. Poole was a peculiar place. It had 31 Magistrates and 14 policemen, yet the present Lord Chancellor added 4, on the ground that his predecessor had added 3, although it was not pretended that more Magistrates were required. In the case of Winchester, where there were 22 Magistrates and 19 policemen, a list of names so submitted was objected to, and, in reply to a question, the Home Secretary said that the Town Council exceeded its duty in so replying to the question asked by the Lord Chancellor. A Return presented to the House some time ago showed that throughout England the number of Justices who during the previous year had virtually abandoned their duties amounted to about 23 per cent. In Wiltshire, 25 per cent. were non-resident

during the year, many permanently so; altogether about 36 per cent. of useless men were on the Commission. In that particular county, in 1886, the Lord Lieutenant appointed 77 Justices of the Peace, of whom 70 were members of the Political Party to which he belonged. It seems to me that the chief qualification necessary to obtain the dignity is to accept office in the Primrose League. In Wales few of the Justices are able to speak Welsh, and, though the great body of the inhabitants are Nonconformists, not 2 per cent. of the Justices are Nonconformists. It is true that one or two working men have been appointed Justices; but when, in 1886, the Attorney General was asked to nominate more he replied that he was not prepared to advise the Lord Chancellor to recommend one class more than another. That is just what I complain of. Gentlemen recommended for the Bench are entirely of one class.

MR. MATTHEWS: That is not what I desire to see.

\*MR. SEALE-HAYNE: In Flintshire, where 97 per cent. of the inhabitants are Nonconformists, there is not a single Dissenter on the Bench. On that point, in answer to a question, the Home Secretary said that Justices were appointed without regard to their religious views, and that the Lord Lieutenant could not discover a single Nonconformist who possessed the necessary qualification. We should like to take it out of the power of the Home Secretary to make such a reply in the future. At Hanley six Justices were appointed in spite of the Petition of the Mayor and Corporation to this House; and in reply to the hon. Member for Sheffield the Minister replied that it was not the duty of the Secretary of State to interfere with the Lord Chancellor, the meaning of which was, apparently, that this House has no control over the Lord Chancellor in any way. In several places there are many more Magistrates than there are policemen, notably in Poole. I will now turn to the Bill. It provides for the retirement of Justices who do not attend to their duties for the space of one year, and that, Mr. Speaker, is desirable in order that more active gentlemen may be appointed to fill

*Mr. Seale-Hayne*

their places. It proposes also that Chairmen of Boards of Guardians, who, as a rule, are men thoroughly well known and respected in their districts, shall be Justices. When we have the long promised District and Parish Councils, the Chairmen of those Bodies, in the same way as elected Mayors, should have the powers of County Magistrates. In regard to election by the County Council, it may be objected that the elections will degenerate into a Party fight. It may be so in some instances, but the nominations at the present time are made for political purposes, and are frequently the subject of a backstairs contest. If we are to have a political contest it had better be in the open. I think the County Councils may be trusted to elect the best men in their localities, and I believe this would be a reform demanded by the working classes. Far from in any way weakening the administration of justice, if we introduced into municipal and county benches men on the elective principle, they would be held in greater respect, especially in the country districts, than at the present time. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed  
"That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Seale-Hayne.*)

\*(5.15.) MR. G. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): It is a fact that the experiment has been made of appointing a few working men as Justices, but we want a thorough revision of the mode of the appointment of Justices. We have no guarantee whatever that the person appointed is at all fit for the position he is called upon to occupy. No one can know anything of Justices of the Peace in many parts of the country without knowing that many of them are less learned in the law than prisoners who are brought before them. I think the time has come when an effort should be made to make the Bench of England worthy of the position it occupies. I admit that in popular elections we may not always get the best men to occupy the best positions, yet, speaking generally, we should have a better chance that the men would be fit for their positions than we

have under the present system. The worst form of appointment is by the nomination of wire-pullers, it matters not to me whether by the Primrose League or by a Radical Association. I contend that the principle is wrong, and that men should be elected to that high and honourable position by reason of fitness. There are thousands of instances in which Justices have been interested in the cases which have come before them, and in which sentences have been inflicted far beyond their deserts. This has, however, been somewhat modified by the growth of public opinion. In the rural districts there have been cases of men found with ground game in their possession and tried by game-preserving Justices, and the wonder is that the people have not been entirely driven out of these rural districts by the way the Game Laws were administered. The Returns also will, I think, show that in some of our ports sailors have been sent to prison by Justices more or less connected with the shipping interest. It is hardly reasonable to think that these Justices would not look upon such cases with some degree of prejudice. The Criminal Law Amendment Act, passed in connection with the Trade Union Act and subsequently repealed, afforded other illustrations, where employers of labour sent to prison men brought up under that Act. In the case of the Labour Laws, the then Home Secretary (Viscount Cross) endeavoured to prevent a miscarriage of justice by sending out some notes on the administration of the Law. It seems to me almost impossible that under the present system of appointment these preferences, partialities, and prejudices shall not come into play. I desire that the Law of England shall be administered in the most enlightened spirit by men competent to administer it, and I call in question the competency of a great number of the men who now sit on the Bench. There are many points in the Bill which may be amended in Committee, and, as this is the first attempt in which we have been successful in bringing the Bill before the House, I support the Second Reading of the Bill.

enough to grasp the very simple principles of our law and to apply them with an unswerving desire to do justice. It has been said that the present system does not not lead to the appointment of as many Non-conformists and as many working men as hon. Members desire. I have myself urged the Lord Lieutenants in Wales to do their best to appoint qualified members of the Nonconformist Body who might be recommended to the Lord Chancellor.

MR. THOMAS ELLIS: Quite in vain.

\*MR. MATTHEWS: No, not quite in vain, though not so many have been recommended as I could wish. The appointment of working men as Magistrates does not fairly arise on this Bill, so that it is not necessary to embark on the enormous change that this Bill proposes in order to modify the qualifications, so as to make it more easy for working men to be appointed to the Commission. Instances have not been infrequent, however, where in boroughs working men have been placed on the Commission. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green talked about Judges interested in a conviction adjudicating in a case. Of course that is very much to be lamented, that we ever should have a Judge sitting to try a case in which his interests incline either to one side or the other; and in our recent legislation we have endeavoured, so far as we could, to prevent that. It is prohibited by provisions in the "Mines Regulation Act," and in many similar Acts of that sort. For my part, I should be extremely glad to see those provisions extended to all cases in which that sort of interest prevails; but I assure the hon. Gentleman that it would not be easy to remedy that state of things by taking Judges from a class from which they have not been hitherto taken. Your *employé* will not have less interest than your employer, and you will have the same objection with regard to working classes as with regard to employers. That is inevitable, I think. These prejudices and these prepossessions will occur as objections to the working man just as much as to the employer.

*Mr. H. Matthews*

MR. GEORGE HOWELL: If the right hon. Gentleman remembers I put it in that form—that prejudices were inevitable.

MR. MATTHEWS: Then we agree. These prejudices are inevitable. It is one of the infirmities of human nature. But this Bill will not cure, and your elected borough and county Justices will be no more free from it than the existing Justices.

\*(6.25.) COLONEL W. CORNWALLIS WEST (Denbigh, W.): As some remarks have been made with regard to Wales I desire to say a few words with reference to the appointment of Magistrates. I can only say that it is wrong and unfair for any insinuation to be thrown out in this House that the Lords Lieutenant of Wales are actuated solely by Party feeling in the appointments they make. I can only say for myself, as one of those officials, that I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to discover gentlemen to be added to the Commission who differ from me in politics and religion, and I have asked persons cognisant with the county to give me the names of any Nonconformists who ought to be put in the Commission of the Peace. When I discovered these gentlemen I appointed them. But I assure the House that so long as the property qualification remains it is almost impossible to find Nonconformists with the necessary qualification. I acknowledge that, and I, for one, would have no objection to see the property qualification either considerably reduced or done away with. I have been fortunate enough to find some gentlemen able to qualify in my county who are Nonconformists, and they make excellent Magistrates; but, at the same time, I do not consider whether a man is a Nonconformist or a member of the Church of England—I never take the slightest regard as to what his religious opinions are, and I believe that the majority of the Lords Lieutenant do the same. If we know that a man is a just man, a man of ability, a man of education, we say that that man will, in all probability, obtain the confidence of the community, and it is unfair to say

that we are actuated in the appointments we make solely from political and religious motives. Now with regard to this Bill, I will not detain the House by criticism, but I confess that I look with the greatest possible mistrust on any suggestions made for the election of Magistrates. I myself believe that in a country like Wales, where Party spirit runs very high, if you are going to give the appointment of Magistrates to the County Councils you will find gentlemen of means and position who do not happen to be members of the dominant Party excluded altogether from the business of the county in which they take a great interest. Now that I think is a decided objection; and I say further that, even now they are largely excluded from the County Councils, that they do not take that interest in the county they used to take, and numbers of them are actually going away. For my part, I would prefer to retain that class of persons in the county and not to deprive them of what I consider they do now extremely well, namely, the judicial business connected with the neighbourhood in which they reside. I can only say that, so far as the county with which I am connected is concerned, I believe that the Magistrates are actuated by a desire to do justice to all, and as a matter of fact I believe that there is not, at the present moment, any actual dislike or suspicion whatever against the Magistrates in the counties; but unfortunately there are those who are actuated with political objects, and who raise a suspicious feeling against them with the desire of excluding them not only from judicial work, but every other work if they can, in the county.

\*(6.30.) MR. MANFIELD (Northampton): I should like to say, Sir, that I am in favour of the elective principle being adopted in the matter of the appointment of Magistrates. In the borough which I represent it has been customary for the Town Council to recommend the Magistrates, and we have never had a single complaint during the whole time that system has been maintained. There have been cases where by backstairs influence a list has been sent to the Lord Chancellor who has very much disappointed them. I am in favour of the

people having the power of electing those who are to govern them, and I believe from my experience that if they make a mistake they will rather bear the burden of that mistake than have a person put in authority over them with whom they have no sympathy, and in whose election they have had no voice. All that is wanted in a Magistrate is that he should be a fair-minded and just man, a man of common sense, who will judge fairly and honestly the people who come before him, and who will temper justice with mercy.

\*(6.33.) MR. LLEWELLYN (Somerset, N.): I do not think, Sir, that the question which is raised in this Bill is one that can be adequately discussed or properly settled by means of a private Members' Bill. One of the chief objections to the Bill in its present shape is this—that no evidence at all has been shown of any dissatisfaction with regard to the action of the Magistrates. — [*Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!"*] — The exclamation "Oh!" does not answer my argument. Sir, no one having any experience of country life can fail to see that there are many and grave objections to having popularly elected Magistrates. I notice that the attacks on the present magisterial system generally come from those who would like to write the letters J.P. after their names, and when they are allowed to do that, the occasions are rare when J.P. does not appear in largest possible type after their names. The chief objection to electing Magistrates by the popular vote is this—that it will at once bring to the front all the faddists. Some would not be voted for unless opposed to vaccination, or the liability of poor people to contribute to the maintenance of their parents, or against convictions for non-attendance of children at school—no man would be elected unless he agreed to do these. Then the liquor trade would come to the front, and I would ask hon. Gentlemen how the work of the counties is to be carried on if all these faddists have their way. Freedom of action by Justices would be rendered impossible where pledges had been imposed and given. Complaint, Sir, has been made that Magistrates did not attend regularly to their duties.



Attend to what? There are, of course, some men who do not sit regularly on the Bench at Petty Sessions or Quarter Sessions, but they do other work, certainly not less important or useful, such as work in connection with Boards of Guardians, Highway Boards, and Assessment Committees. If Magistrates are to be elected for one year, how they are to render effective service in such matters I do not know. There are certain people who are in favour of an alteration of the qualification necessary for Magistrates. I will not go into that now, but I think it might be considered. The whole question ought, indeed, to be considered seriously, and not at the initiative of a private Member. The question, in my opinion, is brought forward more as an electioneering move than as a serious proposal. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. BAUMANN (Peckham): I beg to second that.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(Mr. Llewellyn.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

\*MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire): Sir, I do not think that the argument which has been used by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is a very honourable argument. The hon. Gentleman says that the objections to the present system of selecting Magistrates come, more or less, from those who are anxious to write the letters "J.P." after their name, and that, I think, is not in itself an argument of a very honourable kind to throw out against hon. Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House.

MR. LLEWELLYN: I must really be allowed to explain. I did not say it was because hon. Gentlemen were not Magistrates that they complained, but that the objections which were raised very often came from those who were not Magistrates.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: I am very glad that the hon. Gentleman has withdrawn an

insinuation which, I am bound to say, the whole House understood to be applied to Members sitting on this side. Now, with regard to the speech of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, the House is aware that the hon. Gentleman is the Lord Lieutenant of the county. And, on turning to the list of the Magistrates of the county, I find that one of them is a clergyman for an adjoining county, another a Baronet in Scotland, another a gentleman from Chester, another a Lieutenant-General from Somersetshire.

COL. CORNWALLIS WEST: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but the probability is that the names he has read out are those of gentlemen who once resided in the county and have since left.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: If these gentlemen are only on the list, and never come to the county for effective magisterial purposes, then one useful object will be served by this Bill by the removal of their names. The hon. Gentleman the Member for West Denbigh seemed to think he had placed on the Bench every Nonconformist who was qualified. Sir, the Chairman of the County Council of the County of Denbigh, as in several other counties, has had to be made a Magistrate by the operation of the Local Government Act.

COL. CORNWALLIS WEST: May I be permitted to say that the Chairman of the County Council has been offered the position of a Magistrate two or three times, and he has always refused.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: I admit candidly that I did not know that he had refused, but I can quite understand that he refused to be made a Magistrate according to the present system. I have myself had the honour of being offered the office two or three times, but I refused, because I did not possess the necessary qualification, and because it would not be possible for me to discharge the duties while sitting in this House. In Flintshire the Chairman of the County Council is a Magistrate simply because of his election to the chairmanship. There

Mr. Llewellyn

very few Liberals on the Bench, the Lord Lieutenant has used persistently to put any Nonconformist on the Bench whether he had the necessary qualification or not. In the county of Gloucester the Chairman of the County Council is only Magistrate *ex officio*, and, if this were not enough, the Home Secretary must needs go to Wales for illustration. In Cardiganshire the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions is a Brecknockshire barrister (Mr. Willis Jones), who happens to own a fishing lodge in the county, and the chief part has taken in the work of the Bench as a member of the Joint Police Committee, on which he has used his enmity as a lawyer to frustrate the wishes of the County Council. In Carmarthenshire the Nonconformists form an overwhelming majority (75 to 25 per cent.), and yet there is only one Nonconformist on the Bench, who was appointed after he became a Liberal Unionist. The Lord Lieutenant, the Earl Cawdor, following the example of the Lord Lieutenant of Northamptonshire, refused to place any Nonconformist on the Bench, therefore his

Lord Emlyn was driven from the representation of his county, and is now obliged to go to Manchester in order to try and get a seat in this House. There is nothing against him personally, but he represents a system which boycotts the majority of the people of the county. The result of the County Council elections in Carmarthenshire and Flintshire is largely owing to a deep discontent felt with the present system of electing Magistrates. The hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary tried to picture the terrible evils of the system of elective Magistrates in America. He did not know the system himself, and he used the argument most unfairly. He used the American bogey against the provisions of this Bill, which enables County Councils to elect Magistrates, whereas in reality

the American system is one of direct popular election. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Somersetshire said, If you agree to this Bill, you will have Magistrates elected solely by faddists and the anti-vaccinationists: but these persons have and ought to have very little power, unless

at a General Election. When that is over, they have little influence upon the proceedings of the elected council. The hon. Gentleman said if this Bill passed, it would exclude the minority altogether. I venture to say that I do not believe any County Council in England or Wales would be guilty of such a proceeding; and I have no doubt that county gentlemen, clergymen, and others, would be put upon the Commission of the Peace, from time to time, by the Councils of counties where Nonconformists may be in a large majority.

(6.55.) MR. STORY-MASKELYNE (Wilts, Cricklade): Sir, I believe this Bill to be one that can very easily be put in shape in Committee, and I think it ought to be read a second time. A great deal has been said about the question of election, and something was said about the faddist who would be brought into the field to put this and that person on the Bench, but it seems to be forgotten that what is proposed by this Bill is a system of election carried out not by the people, but by a grave and thoroughly representative body, namely the County Council. To such a body I can see no objection, not to giving the whole of the magisterial appointments to them, but to giving them a portion. This Bill proposes that one Magistrate should be appointed for each Petty Sessional Division. The election of a Magistrate is a very different thing from the election of a Judge by popular vote. In the one case you have to take into consideration that the man who is to be appointed Judge has already shown great judicial capacity and knowledge of Law, but the individual Magistrate is only one of several who act together, and if he can bring to the Bench the necessary time and the necessary knowledge, I think it would be a very good thing if he were appointed in the way proposed by this Bill.

(6.58.) MR. HENEAGE (Great Grimsby): Sir, I agree with the hon. Member for Somersetshire that this is a crude and a badly drawn Bill, but I am not prepared to condemn it in the wholesale fashion adopted by the Home Secretary, and in voting against the Bill I must not be taken as endorsing everything that the Home

Secretary said. I am decidedly in favour of doing away with the property qualification, and I am also in favour of striking off the list those magistrates who have not attended to their duties for the last three years. I think one year is too short.

(7.0.) MR. A. E. GATHORNE-HARDY (Sussex, East Grinstead): I only wish to point out that the property qualification is not removed by this Bill, which merely removes it in the case of the new members to be elected. If it had been simply a question of the property qualification, I should have been very much inclined to agree with the last speaker; but the principle of this Bill appears to be that of electing Magistrates, and to that I am opposed. For that reason I intend to give my vote against the Second Reading.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided:—Ayes 125; Noes 168.—(Div. List, No. 3.)

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Second Reading put off for six months.

#### LOCAL TAXATION (CUSTOMS AND EXCISE) ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 129.)

##### SECOND READING.

(7.15.) Order for Second Reading read.

\*SIR A. ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I bring in this Bill at the request of the Municipal Corporations Association, which consists of the municipal boroughs of the United Kingdom, including both county and non-county boroughs; and a Resolution in favour of this Bill was passed unanimously by that Association after a discussion, in which the interests of both county and non-county boroughs were represented. The bill also bears the endorsement of men of all political parties. By the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890, large funds are placed at the disposal of County Councils for the purposes of technical education. The

administration of those funds vests in the County Council themselves, and the claims of municipal boroughs, which are non-county boroughs, to have the administration of them are not recognised, except permissively under a provision of the Local Taxation Act, by which non-county boroughs may be permitted by the County Council to distribute their own share of the grant. Now, in many cases, this permission has been refused by the County Council, and in some other instances, notably in Lancashire, when permission has been granted, conditions have been fixed which are at variance with the principles of local self-government, and subordinate, in many respects, the non-county borough to the views and instructions of the County Council. The County Council has, in some cases, even attempted to impose conditions as to local government within the borough itself as a condition of the administration of any part of the technical education grant. The grounds on which a change is now proposed in the law are: first, that a provision that the right of administration should not be permissive, but obligatory on the part of municipal boroughs, would be for the advantage of local self-government. The municipal boroughs have set both a precedent and example for county administration. The County Councils of which no one has any jealousy, and certainly not I, but much the contrary, for I heartily supported the County Councils Act of 1888, are a newer institution, and those who are members of them are necessarily wanting yet in the long acquired experience which has been obtained by members of municipal corporations. Then I contend that the proposed change will be an advantage to technical education itself, and I need not remind the House of the variety of forms which technical education necessarily assumes. It has to be adapted to many trades, to many occupations, and to many surroundings. For instance, the County of York is one of the chief governmental areas in England, and the avocations of its people are very various, so that in administering the education grant, an account must be taken of an almost

*Mr. Heneage*

infinite variety of circumstances. It is almost impossible to secure in one Central County Council, men of the varied capacities required in many districts in such a large area for dealing with technical education. And, apart altogether from the question of local self-government, technical education demands local application, and it is only through some local system that it can be made thoroughly effective. The object of this Bill is to make obligatory what, in some counties, has been refused, and in others granted only under disparaging conditions. The Bill will enable any non-county borough having less than 50,000 inhabitants, to require, by notice to the County Council, that its share of the grant shall be placed at its own disposal for the purpose of meeting the wants of that particular locality. The manner in which the Bill is to be worked is indicated by Section 3, in which the share of a borough in the money received by the Council of the county is to be ascertained for the purposes of this Act, according to the proportion which the rateable value of the borough bears to the rateable value of the whole administration of the county; and when that proportion has been ascertained, then the transfer of the fund will be made, and it will in future be administered in the locality according to its requirements. There are one or two precedents which materially bear upon this question. In the first place, in the discussion in this House on the Transfer of Powers Bill, the autonomy of the non-county boroughs was distinctly recognised by the President of the Local Government Board; and there is another precedent even more in point, for in the Technical Education Act of 1889, powers are given to any local authority to provide for technical instruction, and the definition of "local authority" is, that it means the Council of any county or borough, and any Urban Sanitary Authority within the meaning of the Public Health Act, the latter two of which are distinctly local bodies and bodies of small area; and it is obvious that it is undesirable there should be a want of conformity between the sources and areas for the provision of technical instruction. I will only deal finally with one objection which I

think may be raised to this Bill, and that is that the passage of the County Councils Bill has been so recent as to create an indisposition to effect an alteration in it without giving the Act some reasonable trial. My answer is that some years have now elapsed since that measure was passed, and that, undoubtedly, while its general scope and operation has been beneficial to the community, there are minor defects in practice that suggest themselves for remedy, and which, being redressed, will give greater strength to the provisions of the Statute. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir A. Rollit.*)

(7.30.) THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. W. H. LONG, Wilts, Devizes): I am sure, Sir, the House will admit very readily the full right of my hon. Friend to propose a measure of this kind, and to represent, on such a question either Municipal Corporations or the subject of technical education itself. But I want to point out that there are two questions which we have to consider when we approach this Bill. The first is, What would be the effect on Local Government of such a measure; and the second is what would be the effect of the Bill on Technical Education itself? As far as local government goes I am not prepared to say for one moment that the effect would be in any way injurious. At the same time it must be evident that it departs to some extent from the conclusions arrived at by the House when it passed the Bill of 1888, and, later on, when it passed the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890. This question of the subordination of boroughs of less than 50,000 inhabitants to the County Council in the matter of technical education was thoroughly and amply discussed in Committee on both these Bills. The boroughs found able advocates on both sides of the House, but the House came to the conclusion that in the interest of local government the County Councils should be as large and powerful as was possible. Whether it would be wise or not in the interests of technical education to reduce the powers

enough to grasp the very simple principles of our law and to apply them with an unswerving desire to do justice. It has been said that the present system does not not lead to the appointment of as many Nonconformists and as many working men as hon. Members desire. I have myself urged the Lord Lieutenants in Wales to do their best to appoint qualified members of the Nonconformist Body who might be recommended to the Lord Chancellor.

MR. THOMAS ELLIS: Quite in vain.

\*MR. MATTHEWS: No, not quite in vain, though not so many have been recommended as I could wish. The appointment of working men as Magistrates does not fairly arise on this Bill, so that it is not necessary to embark on the enormous change that this Bill proposes in order to modify the qualifications, so as to make it more easy for working men to be appointed to the Commission. Instances have not been infrequent, however, where in boroughs working men have been placed on the Commission. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green talked about Judges interested in a conviction adjudicating in a case. Of course that is very much to be lamented, that we ever should have a Judge sitting to try a case in which his interests incline either to one side or the other; and in our recent legislation we have endeavoured, so far as we could, to prevent that. It is prohibited by provisions in the "Mines Regulation Act," and in many similar Acts of that sort. For my part, I should be extremely glad to see those provisions extended to all cases in which that sort of interest prevails; but I assure the hon. Gentleman that it would not be easy to remedy that state of things by taking Judges from a class from which they have not been hitherto taken. Your *employés* will not have less interest than your employer, and you will have the same objection with regard to working classes as with regard to employers. That is inevitable, I think. These prejudices and these prepossessions will occur as objections to the working man just as much as to the employer.

*Mr. H. Matthews*

MR. GEORGE HOWELL: If the right hon. Gentleman remembers I put it in that form—that prejudices were inevitable.

MR. MATTHEWS: Then we agree. These prejudices are inevitable. It is one of the infirmities of human nature. But this Bill will not cure, and your elected borough and county Justices will be no more free from it than the existing Justices.

\*(6.25.) COLONEL W. CORNWALLIS WEST (Denbigh, W.): As some remarks have been made with regard to Wales I desire to say a few words with reference to the appointment of Magistrates. I can only say that it is wrong and unfair for any insinuation to be thrown out in this House that the Lords Lieutenant of Wales are actuated solely by Party feeling in the appointments they make. I can only say for myself, as one of those officials, that I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to discover gentlemen to be added to the Commission who differ from me in politics and religion, and I have asked persons cognisant with the county to give me the names of any Nonconformists who ought to be put in the Commission of the Peace. When I discovered these gentlemen I appointed them. But I assure the House that so long as the property qualification remains it is almost impossible to find Nonconformists with the necessary qualification. I acknowledge that, and I, for one, would have no objection to see the property qualification either considerably reduced or done away with. I have been fortunate enough to find some gentlemen able to qualify in my county who are Nonconformists, and they make excellent Magistrates; but, at the same time, I do not consider whether a man is a Nonconformist or a member of the Church of England—I never take the slightest regard as to what his religious opinions are, and I believe that the majority of the Lords Lieutenant do the same. If we know that a man is a just man, a man of ability, a man of education, we say that that man will, in all probability, obtain the confidence of the community, and it is unfair to say

that we are actuated in the appointments we make solely from political and religious motives. Now with regard to his Bill, I will not detain the House by criticism, but I confess that I look with the greatest possible mistrust on any suggestions made for the election of Magistrates. I myself believe that in a country like Wales, where Party spirit runs very high, if you are going to give the appointment of Magistrates to the County Councils you will find gentlemen of means and position who do not happen to be members of the dominant Party excluded altogether from the business of the county in which they take a great interest. Now that I think is a decided objection; and I say further that, even now they are largely excluded from the County Councils, that they do not take that interest in the county they used to take, and numbers of them are actually going away. For my part, I would prefer to retain that class of persons in the county and not to deprive them of what I consider they do now extremely well, namely, the judicial business connected with the neighbourhood in which they reside. I can only say that, so far as the county with which I am connected is concerned, I believe that the Magistrates are actuated by a desire to do justice to all, and as a matter of fact I believe that there is not, at the present moment, any actual dislike or suspicion whatever against the Magistrates in the counties; but unfortunately there are those who are actuated with political objects, and who raise a suspicious feeling against them with the desire of excluding them not only from judicial work, but every other work if they can, in the county.

\*(6.30.) MR. MANFIELD (Northampton): I should like to say, Sir, that I am in favour of the elective principle being adopted in the matter of the appointment of Magistrates. In the borough which I represent it has been customary for the Town Council to recommend the Magistrates, and we have never had a single complaint during the whole time that system has been maintained. There have been cases where by backstairs influence a list has been sent to the Lord Chancellor who has very much disappointed them. I am in favour of the

people having the power of electing those who are to govern them, and I believe from my experience that if they make a mistake they will rather bear the burden of that mistake than have a person put in authority over them with whom they have no sympathy, and in whose election they have had no voice. All that is wanted in a Magistrate is that he should be a fair-minded and just man, a man of common sense, who will judge fairly and honestly the people who come before him, and who will temper justice with mercy.

\*(6.33.) MR. LLEWELLYN (Somerset, N.): I do not think, Sir, that the question which is raised in this Bill is one that can be adequately discussed or properly settled by means of a private Members' Bill. One of the chief objections to the Bill in its present shape is this—that no evidence at all has been shown of any dissatisfaction with regard to the action of the Magistrates.—[*Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!"*]—The exclamation "Oh!" does not answer my argument. Sir, no one having any experience of country life can fail to see that there are many and grave objections to having popularly elected Magistrates. I notice that the attacks on the present magisterial system generally come from those who would like to write the letters J.P. after their names, and when they are allowed to do that, the occasions are rare when J.P. does not appear in largest possible type after their names. The chief objection to electing Magistrates by the popular vote is this—that it will at once bring to the front all the faddists. Some would not be voted for unless opposed to vaccination, or the liability of poor people to contribute to the maintenance of their parents, or against convictions for non-attendance of children at school—no man would be elected unless he agreed to do these. Then the liquor trade would come to the front, and I would ask hon. Gentlemen how the work of the counties is to be carried on if all these faddists have their way. Freedom of action by Justices would be rendered impossible where pledges had been imposed and given. Complaint, Sir, has been made that Magistrates did not attend regularly to their duties.

Attend to what? There are, of course, some men who do not sit regularly on the Bench at Petty Sessions or Quarter Sessions, but they do other work, certainly not less important or useful, such as work in connection with Boards of Guardians, Highway Boards, and Assessment Committees. If Magistrates are to be elected for one year, how they are to render effective service in such matters I do not know. There are certain people who are in favour of an alteration of the qualification necessary for Magistrates. I will not go into that now, but I think it might be considered. The whole question ought, indeed, to be considered seriously, and not at the initiative of a private Member. The question, in my opinion, is brought forward more as an electioneering move than as a serious proposal. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. BAUMANN (Peckham): I beg to second that.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(Mr. Llewellyn.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

\*MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire): Sir, I do not think that the argument which has been used by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is a very honourable argument. The hon. Gentleman says that the objections to the present system of selecting Magistrates come, more or less, from those who are anxious to write the letters "J.P." after their name, and that, I think, is not in itself an argument of a very honourable kind to throw out against hon. Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House.

MR. LLEWELLYN: I must really be allowed to explain. I did not say it was because hon. Gentlemen were not Magistrates that they complained, but that the objections which were raised very often came from those who were not Magistrates.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: I am very glad that the hon. Gentleman has withdrawn an

insinuation which, I am bound to say, the whole House understood to be applied to Members sitting on this side. Now, with regard to the speech of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, the House is aware that the hon. Gentleman is the Lord Lieutenant of the county. And, on turning to the list of the Magistrates of the county, I find that one of them is a clergyman for an adjoining county, another a Baronet in Scotland, another a gentleman from Chester, another a Lieutenant-General from Somersetshire.

COL. CORNWALLIS WEST: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but the probability is that the names he has read out are those of gentlemen who once resided in the county and have since left.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: If these gentlemen are only on the list, and never come to the county for effective magisterial purposes, then one useful object will be served by this Bill by the removal of their names. The hon. Gentleman the Member for West Denbigh seemed to think he had placed on the Bench every Nonconformist who was qualified. Sir, the Chairman of the County Council of the County of Denbigh, as in several other counties, has had to be made a Magistrate by the operation of the Local Government Act.

COL. CORNWALLIS WEST: May I be permitted to say that the Chairman of the County Council has been offered the position of a Magistrate two or three times, and he has always refused.

\*MR. T. ELLIS: I admit candidly that I did not know that he had refused, but I can quite understand that he refused to be made a Magistrate according to the present system. I have myself had the honour of being offered the office two or three times, but I refused, because I did not possess the necessary qualification, and because it would not be possible for me to discharge the duties while sitting in this House. In Flintshire the Chairman of the County Council is a Magistrate simply because of his election to the chairmanship. There

Mr. Llewellyn

are very few Liberals on the Bench, and the Lord Lieutenant has refused persistently to put any Nonconformist on the Bench whether he had the necessary qualification or not. In the county of Anglesey the Chairman of the County Council is only Magistrate *ex officio*, and, as if this were not enough, the Home Secretary must needs go to Wales for his illustration. In Cardiganshire the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions is a Worcestershire barrister (Mr. Willis Bund), who happens to own a fishing lodge in the county, and the chief part he has taken in the work of the Bench is as a member of the Joint Police Committee, on which he has used his ingenuity as a lawyer to frustrate the wishes of the County Council. In Carmarthenshire the Nonconformists form an overwhelming majority (75 to 85 per cent.), and yet there is only one Nonconformist on the Bench, and he was appointed after he became a Liberal Unionist. The Lord Lieutenant, the Earl Cawdor, following the example of the Lord Lieutenant of Flintshire, refused to place any Nonconformist on the Bench, therefore his son Lord Emlyn was driven from the representation of his county, and is now obliged to go to Manchester in order to try and get a seat in this House. There is nothing against him personally, but he represents a system which boycotts the majority of the people of the county. The result of the County Council elections in Carmarthenshire and Flintshire is largely owing to the deep discontent felt with the present system of electing Magistrates. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary tried to picture the terrible evils of the system of elective Magistrates in America. He did not know the system himself, and he used the argument most unfairly. He used the American bogey against the provisions of this Bill, which enables County Councils to select Magistrates, whereas in reality the American system is one of direct popular election. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Somersetshire said, If you agree to this Bill, you will have Magistrates elected solely by the faddists and the anti-vaccinationists: but these persons have and ought to have very little power, unless

at a General Election. When that is over, they have little influence upon the proceedings of the elected council. The hon. Gentleman said if this Bill passed, it would exclude the minority altogether. I venture to say that I do not believe any County Council in England or Wales would be guilty of such a proceeding; and I have no doubt that county gentlemen, clergymen, and others, would be put upon the Commission of the Peace, from time to time, by the Councils of counties where Nonconformists may be in a large majority.

(6.55.) MR. STORY-MASKELYNE (Wilts, Cricklade): Sir, I believe this Bill to be one that can very easily be put in shape in Committee, and I think it ought to be read a second time. A great deal has been said about the question of election, and something was said about the faddist who would be brought into the field to put this and that person on the Bench, but it seems to be forgotten that what is proposed by this Bill is a system of election carried out not by the people, but by a grave and thoroughly representative body, namely the County Council. To such a body I can see no objection, not to giving the whole of the magisterial appointments to them, but to giving them a portion. This Bill proposes that one Magistrate should be appointed for each Petty Sessional Division. The election of a Magistrate is a very different thing from the election of a Judge by popular vote. In the one case you have to take into consideration that the man who is to be appointed Judge has already shown great judicial capacity and knowledge of Law, but the individual Magistrate is only one of several who act together, and if he can bring to the Bench the necessary time and the necessary knowledge, I think it would be a very good thing if he were appointed in the way proposed by this Bill.

(6.58.) MR. HENEAGE (Great Grimsby): Sir, I agree with the hon. Member for Somersetshire that this is a crude and a badly drawn Bill, but I am not prepared to condemn it in the wholesale fashion adopted by the Home Secretary, and in voting against the Bill I must not be taken as endorsing everything that the Home



Secretary said. I am decidedly in favour of doing away with the property qualification, and I am also in favour of striking off the list those magistrates who have not attended to their duties for the last three years. I think one year is too short.

(7.0.) MR. A. E. GATHORNE-HARDY (Sussex, East Grinstead): I only wish to point out that the property qualification is not removed by this Bill, which merely removes it in the case of the new members to be elected. If it had been simply a question of the property qualification, I should have been very much inclined to agree with the last speaker; but the principle of this Bill appears to be that of electing Magistrates, and to that I am opposed. For that reason I intend to give my vote against the Second Reading.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided:—Ayes 125; Noes 168.—(Div. List, No. 3.)

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Second Reading put off for six months.

#### LOCAL TAXATION (CUSTOMS AND EXCISE) ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 129.)

##### SECOND READING.

(7.15.) Order for Second Reading read.

\*SIR A. ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I bring in this Bill at the request of the Municipal Corporations Association, which consists of the municipal boroughs of the United Kingdom, including both county and non-county boroughs; and a Resolution in favour of this Bill was passed unanimously by that Association after a discussion, in which the interests of both county and non-county boroughs were represented. The bill also bears the endorsement of men of all political parties. By the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890, large funds are placed at the disposal of County Councils for the purposes of technical education. The

administration of those funds vests in the County Council themselves, and the claims of municipal boroughs, which are non-county boroughs, to have the administration of them are not recognised, except permissively under a provision of the Local Taxation Act, by which non-county boroughs may be permitted by the County Council to distribute their own share of the grant. Now, in many cases, this permission has been refused by the County Council, and in some other instances, notably in Lancashire, when permission has been granted, conditions have been fixed which are at variance with the principles of local self-government, and subordinate, in many respects, the non-county borough to the views and instructions of the County Council. The County Council has, in some cases, even attempted to impose conditions as to local government within the borough itself as a condition of the administration of any part of the technical education grant. The grounds on which a change is now proposed in the law are: first, that a provision that the right of administration should not be permissive, but obligatory on the part of municipal boroughs, would be for the advantage of local self-government. The municipal boroughs have set both a precedent and example for county administration. The County Councils of which no one has any jealousy, and certainly not I, but much the contrary, for I heartily supported the County Councils Act of 1888, are a newer institution, and those who are members of them are necessarily wanting yet in the long acquired experience which has been obtained by members of municipal corporations. Then I contend that the proposed change will be an advantage to technical education itself, and I need not remind the House of the variety of forms which technical education necessarily assumes. It has to be adapted to many trades, to many occupations, and to many surroundings. For instance, the County of York is one of the chief governmental areas in England, and the avocations of its people are very various, so that in administering the education grant, an account must be taken of an almost

*Mr. Heneage*

infinite variety of circumstances. It is almost impossible to secure in one Central County Council, men of the varied capacities required in many districts in such a large area for dealing with technical education. And, apart altogether from the question of local self-government, technical education demands local application, and it is only through some local system that it can be made thoroughly effective. The object of this Bill is to make obligatory what, in some counties, has been refused, and in others granted only under disparaging conditions. The Bill will enable any non-county borough having less than 50,000 inhabitants, to require, by notice to the County Council, that its share of the grant shall be placed at its own disposal for the purpose of meeting the wants of that particular locality. The manner in which the Bill is to be worked is indicated by Section 3, in which the share of a borough in the money received by the Council of the county is to be ascertained for the purposes of this Act, according to the proportion which the rateable value of the borough bears to the rateable value of the whole administration of the county; and when that proportion has been ascertained, then the transfer of the fund will be made, and it will in future be administered in the locality according to its requirements. There are one or two precedents which materially bear upon this question. In the first place, in the discussion in this House on the Transfer of Powers Bill, the autonomy of the non-county boroughs was distinctly recognised by the President of the Local Government Board; and there is another precedent even more in point, for in the Technical Education Act of 1889, powers are given to any local authority to provide for technical instruction, and the definition of "local authority" is, that it means the Council of any county or borough, and any Urban Sanitary Authority within the meaning of the Public Health Act, the latter two of which are distinctly local bodies and bodies of small area; and it is obvious that it is undesirable there should be a want of conformity between the sources and areas for the provision of technical instruction. I will only deal finally with one objection which I

think may be raised to this Bill, and that is that the passage of the County Councils Bill has been so recent as to create an indisposition to effect an alteration in it without giving the Act some reasonable trial. My answer is that some years have now elapsed since that measure was passed, and that, undoubtedly, while its general scope and operation has been beneficial to the community, there are minor defects in practice that suggest themselves for remedy, and which, being redressed, will give greater strength to the provisions of the Statute. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir A. Rollet.*)

(7.30.) THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. W. H. LONG, Wilts, Devizes): I am sure, Sir, the House will admit very readily the full right of my hon. Friend to propose a measure of this kind, and to represent, on such a question either Municipal Corporations or the subject of technical education itself. But I want to point out that there are two questions which we have to consider when we approach this Bill. The first is, What would be the effect on Local Government of such a measure; and the second is what would be the effect of the Bill on Technical Education itself? As far as local government goes I am not prepared to say for one moment that the effect would be in any way injurious. At the same time it must be evident that it departs to some extent from the conclusions arrived at by the House when it passed the Bill of 1888, and, later on, when it passed the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890. This question of the subordination of boroughs of less than 50,000 inhabitants to the County Council in the matter of technical education was thoroughly and amply discussed in Committee on both these Bills. The boroughs found able advocates on both sides of the House, but the House came to the conclusion that in the interest of local government the County Councils should be as large and powerful as was possible. Whether it would be wise or not in the interests of technical education to reduce the powers

deliberately conferred on County Councils by these Acts I will not now stop to consider. How can we regard the Bill from the point of view of technical education? My hon. Friend told us that there were some cases in which County Councils had rather restricted their action. I do not imagine they have been absolutely free from blame in the matter, but anybody who has noted their action on the Bill of 1890 will agree that they have taken enormous pains to give practical effect to that Bill, and devoted themselves to it with a rare ability and spirit, which does them credit, and it would be a mistake to do anything in a hurry and without grave consideration, which might result in restricting their action, and thereby setting back to that extent technical education throughout the country. My hon. Friend, in anticipating some of the objections which might be raised against the Bill, said that some years had elapsed since the two Acts were passed. That term, some years, is capable of very elastic interpretation. The County Councils had only been in existence three years—in fact, the three years since their first election have not yet expired—and the Local Taxation Bill was passed in 1890.

SIR A. ROLLIT: I did not refer to that.

MR. LONG: Both measures are comparatively new, and deal with very important questions. I hope I have said nothing which would appear to oppose the Bill or the principle it upholds. It may be that it is a good measure, and that its principle is good, but the House must bear in mind that the possibilities to which I have referred do exist, and I would recommend the House, remembering these facts, and also that the Bill was only printed and circulated this morning, and also the largeness of the question, not to proceed to decide aye or no on this Bill to-night, if my hon. Friend and his supporters will consent to the adjournment of the Debate, for these brief reasons—that the County Councils, which will be seriously affected, may have time to consider the measure; and that those who are interested in technical education may decide whether the measure

is one to find favour with them. At present both these bodies are in the same position as the House with regard to the Bill and its proposals. Then, when the House and the Government are seized of this information, they will be in a better position to decide whether the principle should be carried, or whether local government and the promotion of technical education should be left as it is. I venture further to add this: The House will regret as much as I do the absence of the President of the Local Government Board through illness, and is, I am sure, sensible of the loss sustained by his absence. If my hon. Friend and his supporters will consent to the course I suggest, when the Bill comes on again the House will, I hope, have the benefit of the presence and counsel of my right hon. Friend, who has been so closely identified with the measures with which this Bill deals. I beg to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
“That the Debate be now adjourned.”  
—(*Mr. Long.*)

SIR A. ROLLIT: I do not think, Sir, I can resist the appeal of my hon. Friend, and, with the concurrence of my hon. Friends, I accede to it.

Motion agreed to.

#### GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Accounts presented,—for the year ended 31st March 1891, with report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### SIAM (No. 1, 1892).

Copy presented,—of Report on a Journey in the Mè-Kong Valley by Mr. W. J. Archer, First Assistant in Her Majesty's Consular Service in Siam (with a map) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS (1878 to 1890).

Copies presented,—of an Order, dated the 5th February 1892, and the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1892, No. 2 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

House adjourned at twenty minutes  
before Eight o'clock.

*Mr. W. H. Long*

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 17th February, 1892.

House met at Twelve o'clock.

) Notice taken, that 40 Members not present; House counted, Members being found present,

## BANK OF ENGLAND.

laid upon the Table by the House.

[All applications made by the First the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy of the Bank of England for additional Government authorised by Parliament on 5th January, 1891, to 5th January, 1892, &c.]

## B. IN DIVISION LIST, No. 2.

ROBINSON (Gloucester): I wish to call your attention to the error in the taking down of the names for the Division List. My name has been put down as having voted against the amendment of the hon. Member for West Lancashire (Mr. Sexton). I beg to say I was not in the House, and did not vote on that occasion.

PEAKER: The correction has been made. The hon. Member will observe an *erratum* in the issue of to-day, the name of the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. Robinson) being inserted in the list instead of that of the hon. Member.

## MEMBERS OF THE DAY.

## MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND)

BILL.—(No. 34.)

## SECOND READING.

for Second Reading read.

) Mr. CONDON (Tipperary, rising to move that this Bill be read a second time I have the honour to announce the result, believing in the justice of the claim embodied in the Bill, and I am sure that the measure will commend itself to the consideration of the House. The main provisions of the Bill are simply an embodiment of the principle that the municipal franchise

in Ireland should be assimilated to the same franchise as England. We have noticed in the Speech from the Throne that Her Majesty's Government intend to propose legislation

"For applying to Ireland the general principles affecting Local Government which have already been adopted in Great Britain."

And the proposition we now submit is that the principle shall be applied to the municipal franchise. This Bill has been discussed in this House over and over again, and the consensus of opinion, even in times not quite so advanced as the present, has been in favour of the principle of the Bill. I assume that there are a great many Members in the House acquainted with the extraordinary position Ireland occupies in relation to this matter as compared with England; but, still, I think it my duty to lay before the House a few points of dissimilarity in the position of our country. There are four classes of municipal towns in Ireland, each class having a different franchise. There are the municipal corporations of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Londonderry, and so on, eleven in number, and in these towns the municipal franchise is of the most prohibitive character. It is a £10 qualification, and any hon. Member who is acquainted with Ireland will acknowledge that a £10 rating qualification means almost disfranchisement to the population generally. In the second class are the towns incorporated under the Act 9 Geo. IV.; in the third class are the towns under the Towns Improvement Act of 1854, and these are 77 in number; and, lastly, there are the townships with special Acts, such as Blackrock and others. In the first group we have mostly a £10 rating qualification. Dublin and Belfast are exceptions, and Belfast occupies a distinct position, owing to the Act which was passed in recent years at the instance of my hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton). Though Dublin has nominally a household franchise, yet it is in reality a rating qualification of £8; that is to say, a man must have been resident for three years, or be rated at £8. I need not go into particulars of other towns in the third and fourth classes. In the third class a £4 rating qualifies for the franchise, which means in some of the small towns practical disqualification

for the bulk of the inhabitants. Our contention, I say, is, as we put it forward in this Bill, that Ireland and England should be on the same footing as regards the municipal franchise. We hope and believe that the House will agree with us in this contention, that the House will affirm the principle, that the people of Ireland are as much entitled to the use of the municipal franchise as are the people of England, and I say they are as qualified to exercise the right of citizens in every respect as are the people of England. I have some figures here, which I have taken from the latest statistics I have at hand, which will show the House with what gross unfairness we are treated in this matter. There are 11 corporate towns in Ireland governed by Mayors, Aldermen, and Councillors, and I will quote figures in relation to six of these. I could quote the figures for all if it were necessary to do so, but I do not think it is desirable. Those I give will be sufficient to illustrate my contention. I begin with Dublin, and I will show you the population, the numbers on the burgess roll and on the Parliamentary register, because I have a word or two to say upon the difference between the Parliamentary and the municipal franchise; and I will afterwards institute a comparison between these towns and towns of an equal population in England, to show what an anomaly exists. I take the City of Dublin, the metropolis of Ireland. It has a population of 249,000, a burgess roll of 6,644, and a Parliamentary register of 30,000. Well, it appears to me, and I feel sure that no Member of the House will contest the proposition, that the affairs of the nation, as discussed in this Imperial Parliament, are not of less importance than the affairs with which a corporation has to deal; and if Parliament in its wisdom admits 30,000 of the population of the City of Dublin to the Parliamentary franchise, then surely, at least, an equal proportion should be permitted to exercise the municipal franchise. Yet here we find that the Parliamentary franchise exceeds by almost five times the municipal franchise. In the City of Cork there is a population of 80,000, and I find on the burgess roll 2,059 names, and the Parliamentary register has 11,500,

*Mr. Condon*

and my remark applies equally to Cork. The City of Limerick is a more notable instance in the same direction. With a population of 38,000, Limerick has a burgess roll of 457, whereas on the Parliamentary register there are 4,827 of the inhabitants. Well, of course, if there were nothing else to attract the attention of hon. Members as something demanding remedy, Limerick would be sufficient upon which to base my claim for reform. Waterford has a population of 22,000, burgess roll 679, and the Parliamentary franchise in the hands of 4,000. Londonderry, with a population of 29,000, has a burgess roll of 799, and a Parliamentary register of 4,200. From the extraordinary differences in the figures relating to the two franchises, as by Law established, it must strike hon. Members as being of such a character as to demand immediate attention at our hands. I stated a while ago that in the Speech from the Throne the Government have signified their intention of meeting out equal justice in the matter of local government to England, Scotland, and Ireland; and now I invite attention to figures as they affect towns in England of about the same size as the Irish towns I have mentioned, to show the discrepancy, the injustice, of the franchise law under which our people suffer almost municipal disfranchisement. First, I take, as comparable with Dublin in population, the English town of Bristol. Dublin has a population of 249,000, Bristol has somewhat less in population, 206,000. But while Bristol has this smaller population, it has a burgess roll of 27,600, as against 6,644 in Dublin. Certainly an extraordinary difference between the two. Then Cork has its 80,000 inhabitants, and 2,059 on its burgess roll, and I take the town of Cardiff as about the same size, a population of 82,000, that is 2,000 more than Cork. Let Cardiff have all the benefit it is entitled to from this extra population. Still, that does not explain why Cardiff should have a burgess roll of 11,400 and Cork only 2,059. Surely, revision is wanted here. Now, Limerick affords a most remarkable example of the extraordinary condition of municipal affairs as between England and Ireland. The

City of Limerick, as I have said, has a population of 38,000, and I take the English town of Cambridge for the sake of comparison. Cambridge has a population of 35,363, or, in round figures, 3,000 less than Limerick. But while the burgess roll in Limerick numbers 457, Cambridge, with its population 3,000 less, has 5,400 burgesses on its roll. Well, then, I say, if we are to have anything approaching equal treatment in these matters, Limerick demands attention. Waterford has 22,000 inhabitants and 679 on its burgess roll; and I find in England, Canterbury, with almost the same population—within a few hundreds—has a burgess roll of 3,090. Londonderry comes next, population 29,000, burgess roll 799; and the town in England I compare with it is Colchester, with upwards of 28,000 inhabitants and a burgess roll of 4,500. In the town of Clonmel there is a population of 9,300, and its burgess roll numbers 275, while the English town of Harrogate has a population of 9,400, but 1,700 burgesses. These figures will show the House how unfairly Ireland is treated in its municipal representation in an equal number of English and Irish towns. While in Ireland, out of a population of 427,000, there are something less than 11,000 of the inhabitants on the burgess rolls, in England, with a population of nearly 383,000, there are 53,700 on the burgess rolls. In other words, the proportion of burgesses to population in England is seven times greater than is the case in Ireland. The Parliamentary franchise in Ireland is a household franchise, and through that franchise householders have the power to elect representatives of Irish interests in this Imperial Parliament. But do you consider the national affairs to be of secondary importance to parochial and municipal matters—that you require a higher qualification for the municipal franchise? Such a contention would not bear discussion. Then, do you think that the hundreds of thousands who enjoy the Parliamentary franchise are more intelligent or better able to exercise that franchise than the educated intelligent artizans and traders in Irish towns, who are debarred from exercising any influence in the

management of the towns where they have the greatest interest? Speaking from personal knowledge and experience among the artizan and trading classes in Ireland, I claim to say that there is no class of the community better qualified to exercise any franchise. There is gross inconsistency and injustice in this display of mistrust towards these masses of the Irish people. While they are entitled to vote for a Member of this House, and in a great many cases for Poor Law Guardians, they are debarred by Statute from voting for a member of a Town Council, and in regard to matters in which they have the most direct interest. The Bill I confidently recommend to the House is to remedy this anomalous state of affairs. Municipal boroughs in Ireland since Reformation days, and especially in latter times since they became popularised and nationalised, have given proof of their capacity to govern themselves efficiently, intelligently, and economically. We ask for nothing under this Bill beyond what the English people enjoy, and we appeal to the fair minds of English Members to give to the people of Ireland those rights—we do not call them privileges—those rights to which they are honestly entitled. I hope that if any opposition to the Bill should arise it will not emanate from any Irish Member, no matter what shade of politics he may represent here. Even should there be some opposition I feel that the justice of our claim must enlist the sympathy of the House generally on behalf of the Bill, the Second Reading of which I have now the honour to move.

(12.57.) MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): In rising to second the Motion for Second Reading, I think I may congratulate the new Chief Secretary for Ireland on the opportunity offered him to inaugurate his term of office by effecting this useful and long desired reform. I will not insult him or his Party by assuming for a moment that he, or they, have any intention to defend the monstrous state of things disclosed by the facts put forward in the speech of my hon. Friend, in a Session such as this, when we are promised a measure of County Government, framed, broadly speaking, on equal lines with the measure which

has become law in England in the last few years. It would be absurd, indeed, to begin a Session of this kind with a defence from the Government Bench of such a state of things as my hon. Friend has described in his speech. The law relating to Municipal Corporations in Ireland is simply an anachronism which it is impossible to defend, and which I do not believe there will be any attempt to defend. We all know that when Sir Robert Peel consented to reform Municipal Corporations in Ireland, he, instead of meting out to that country the same beneficial treatment which had a few years before been applied to English Corporations, accompanied and clogged the benefit conveyed to Ireland in a number of ways. One of these was the abolition of a large number of Municipal Corporations, which had up to that time existed; and, secondly, there was the setting up as between England and Ireland of an invidious distinction; for whereas in England every occupier of rated premises had a municipal vote conferred upon him, there was set up in Ireland a £10 franchise, which has existed from that day to this. The law in Ireland in this matter remains exactly what it was 50 years ago; while for England Statute after Statute has been passed, broadening the franchise and extending popular rights and privileges, the law for Ireland remains substantively as it did when Her Majesty came to the Throne in 1837. Now, my hon. Friend has told the House that while in England every householder occupying rated premises exercises the municipal franchise, in Ireland that is so far from being the case that a £10 qualification is required. That naked fact does not disclose all the enormity of this absurd state of things, for let me call attention to the fact that in Ireland there is a great difference between rate and valuation. I occupy in the City of Cork rated premises valued at £10, the rent of which is £50. Now, I should like to hear any English Member in any part of the House getting up and attempting to defend a state of things of that kind as applied to England. Well, in the result, we have this extraordinary variation my hon. Friend has described as

between the municipal and Parliamentary franchise, and as between the municipal franchise in England and in Ireland, and we have the extraordinary anomaly set up that, while for Parliamentary purposes you have a franchise existing in Ireland which one of the loyal minority described at the time it was extended as the "mud hovel franchise"—which confers a vote on the occupier of a mud hovel in Ireland—that while a man may be entitled to give a vote on questions of Imperial importance, on a question of peace or war, of Home Rule—on any question concerning the nation at large; when it comes to a question of the repair of the streets of the town in which he dwells, or the enforcement of sanitary regulations or other matters of municipal government, then Parliament shuts him out from any exercise of the franchise. Not only so, but other anomalies follow. My hon. Friend has mentioned that this state of things was so gross that when Parliament came to deal with the municipal affairs of Belfast the House felt itself compelled, before passing a scheme involving an expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of pounds in that city, to make provision to enable burgesses to express their opinion by an extension of the franchise. So you have arrived at this state of things, that while in the City of Dublin you have some 6,000 burgesses on the roll, in Belfast you have 30,000. So you have the anomaly as between the Parliamentary and municipal franchise, as between the municipal franchise in England and Ireland, and even among the 11 municipal boroughs of Ireland to which my hon. Friend referred, you have three different municipal franchises in existence. Who can defend a state of things of this description? I am sure the Government will not attempt it. Then, again, in Ireland we are in the unfortunate position that, not merely are we crippled by the Municipal Law, but also by the Act in reference to the collection of rates; and that which is conferred by the one Act is taken away by the other. For Dublin, Parliament passed a special Act conferring the right to vote on every householder, distinguishing the inhabitants of Dublin

*Mr. Maurice Healy*

from the rest of the community. But then the Act for the collection of rates stepped in; the effect of which was to impose a qualification of £8 valuation. So, in Dublin, after Parliament had passed an Act conferring a vote on every householder, the effect of the Collection of Rates Act was to restrict that franchise to premises valued at £8. In a similar way, in small towns, the effect of restricting the franchise to £4 valuation is to shut out from the municipal vote that very class which I venture to say has the highest title to it and the most need for it. Who are the people most affected by the government of the small towns in Ireland? Who are most in need of sanitary matters being looked after? Those who occupy insanitary houses—the poor, the indigent, the needy. But these are of the very class Parliament has deliberately shut out from the exercise of the municipal franchise. I am sure, if we succeed in inducing the House to amend the law as regards the larger towns, the Government will show no disposition to limit the reform, but will extend it to the 79 towns governed under the Act of 1854. I assume that no one will attempt to defend the anomaly whereby in one small town the qualification for a vote is a £5 valuation, and in another small town five miles off a £4 qualification obtains. This matter of the municipal franchise has very largely attracted the attention of the working classes during the last two or three years, and anyone who has read the newspapers will know that it is a matter in which the artisans in the larger towns, such as Dublin and Cork, take the greatest interest. Naturally they think it is a very strange state of things that after Parliament has passed a great reform, and every householder has a vote for Parliamentary purposes conferred upon him, he should find himself excluded from a share in the municipal franchise. I assume the Government will announce an intention of putting an end to such an absurd state of things. But, if that should not be the case, then I am afraid we shall be obliged to draw some very strange conclusions as to the proposals the right hon. Gentleman intends to make when to-morrow he rises to announce reforms in the system of

County Government in Ireland. But I will not insult the right hon. Gentleman by assuming he has any disposition to defend the present state of things. This Bill is intended to equalize the law between England and Ireland in the matter of the municipal franchise, and, after the repeated declarations in this House as to the necessity for governing Ireland by equal laws, I assume that the opportunity has now come for giving effect to those good intentions, and that a Second Reading will now be given to this Bill. If this Bill is required in the present day, it is simply because Parliament has not been able to attend to Irish matters. To-day, for about the twentieth time, the Irish Members introduce this measure; and I hope now, at the eleventh hour, the House will be induced to accept a Bill which will place the Irish people on a scale of equality with the people of England.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”—(*Mr. Condon.*)

(1.15.) MR. DUNBAR BARTON (Armagh, Mid): The hon. Member who introduced this Bill said that no Member of the House could find fault with it. He referred to certain statistics and published figures, which I would remind the House had reference only to the municipal corporations; but he did not introduce any statistics with reference to the far larger, and by far the most far-reaching part of the Bill, to which I take strong exception. Sir, I take exception to this Bill on three grounds. In the first place, it is a misleading Bill. Its title would mislead anybody acquainted with Ireland or with Irish municipal law. I did not rely upon it, though it did mislead me. When I heard that a Municipal Franchise Bill was to be introduced in this House, I at once assumed it referred only to the municipal corporations, and I will show hon. Members opposite that I was right in assuming that. I have followed, although I was not in Parliament at the time, the Bills hon. Gentlemen opposite introduced in 1889 and 1890. I have these Bills with me, and I must say that they are very different indeed from



this Bill; and one question which I should like to ask some of the hon. Gentlemen who will follow me in this debate is, Why is it that in these two Bills, which I have read most carefully, they studiously confine them to the municipal corporations, and that this year, in this Bill, the volume has grown, so that instead of a Bill dealing with 11 municipal corporations this Bill deals with 116 towns and townships? Why is it, Sir, that without any notice whatever this Bill has been extended in this way, so that, having been twice introduced in a form which made it applicable only to eleven municipal corporations, it is now to be extended to these 116 towns and townships? The Irish people have no knowledge of that change. The statistics of the hon. Gentleman opposite have reference to the municipal corporations; and in so far as those correspond with the municipal corporations in England under the Act of 1882, hon. Members opposite have much to urge, with justice and plausibility, with reference to this Bill. When they speak of assimilating the Law of England to the Law of Ireland, they want to assimilate it to the Municipal Corporations Act of 1882. But, Sir, if that is so, they should confine their Bill to the limits of the Act of 1882. I am bound to say I am not offering any narrow opposition to this Bill, and I am certainly not going to say anything disrespectful of my fellow-countrymen, but I do say that this is a Bill which, under a disguise, proposes to effect a change of which Ireland knows nothing. Now, what are the towns which will be affected? There are 12 towns and townships under a special Act of their own, and I should like to ask the representatives of North and South Dublin and of the St. Stephen's Green Division whether they are aware what the Bill proposes, and whether they know that the Bill contains provisions which were not in the Bills of the last two years I have mentioned? Within the last three weeks I saw a discussion that took place in the Blackrock township with reference to a Sewage Bill, and the question of the franchise being altered was then discussed, but no mention was made, or hint given, during that discussion by the people of

that county that they were aware that a Bill was in preparation or about to be introduced to alter the municipal franchise. These towns and townships will be surprised to hear to-morrow that this House has been occupied to-day in discussing this matter, upon a Bill which seeks to effect so large a change. When the House was asked the other night to confirm a Resolution that it was incapable of governing Ireland, I think we are entitled to put forward this Bill as a specimen of what Irish Members would do in an Irish Parliament. I want to know whether these towns and townships are aware that a Bill of this kind has been introduced into this House? In Ireland the franchise varies. In Blackrock the franchise is £8, in Bray £7, in Dalkey £4, in Kingstown £4. Under the Act of 1828 there are eight towns, including Armagh, which I have the honour of representing, with a £5 franchise. Hon. Members seem to think that towns like Armagh should have their constitution altered without the Town Council or anybody else being consulted. There are 84 towns under the Act of 1854 which have a £4 rating franchise that will be entirely altered by this Bill. I ask, have any of these towns been consulted? If not, then I submit that my constituents should not have their franchise altered without full notice and adequate opportunity of discussion. Now, I must refer for one moment to the Bill itself. I observe that the term of residence proposed by this Bill is six months. In England the period fixed by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1882 is 12 months.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): No; rating 12, residence 6.

MR. BARTON: I do not think that six months is the period of the English Act. However, passing from that, I find a remarkable change in this Bill as compared with the Bills which were introduced in 1889 and 1890. I find that the rates to be discharged in order to qualify a voter are only the rates paid by the Governing Body—the borough rate.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): That is in accordance with Irish law.

MR. BARTON: The English law requires that the poor rate, as well as the borough rates, should be paid, in

*Mr. Dunbar Barton*

order to enable a householder to qualify, and in the Bills of 1889 and 1890 a provision of that kind was found. The change this year is so remarkable as to justify me in asking hon. Gentlemen opposite for some explanation. Then, Sir, there is an extraordinary omission to which I would like to call attention, namely, the absence of any proviso relating to the disqualification of voters, which is in the Belfast Act and the English Act. Do hon. Members mean to repeal this disqualification and to enfranchise those who are in receipt of poor relief? Now, Sir, the last two sections of the Bill are very remarkable sections, because, unlike anything I have ever seen in an Act of Parliament, the Bill proposes that the duty of making and issuing claims, revising the lists, hearing the claims, and so forth, should be left to the Local Government Board, to which they also give the wide discretion of enumerating the Acts, which they thought, judicially or otherwise, were repealed by this Act. The ordinary course is to set forth carefully in a Schedule any Acts which are altered, so that hon. Members may know which are repealed and which are not. Here the Local Government Board are left to do the work. I am glad that hon. Members have such confidence in the Local Government Board. It is certainly most suggestive, now that we are about to be asked to establish County Government in Ireland. When it is urged that there is necessity in Ireland as in England and Scotland for a Central Authority to control the County Boards, it will not lie in the mouths of hon. Gentlemen opposite to deny that the Irish Local Government Board can be safely entrusted with such controlling power, because they have given to the Local Government Board in their own Bill powers of modifying and repealing Acts of Parliament far wider than anything that Irish Members sitting on this side of the House would suggest with reference to Local Bodies in Ireland. I do not blame hon. Members much for this Bill, because we have it on the authority of a Dublin newspaper, the *Evening Press*, that this is a hurriedly-drafted Bill, introduced for the purpose of catching this Wednesday. Nor, Sir, do I think

hon. Members can blame me as the Representative of a constituency, three or four towns of which will be affected, if I take objection to their privileges and their constitution being altered by a Bill drawn in this hasty way. It is disrespectful to the Municipal Authorities. I will ask, Do hon. Gentlemen seriously invite the House to endorse this Bill, which their own newspapers says has been hastily drafted, and which they cannot say adequately deals with the subject? If they want to assimilate the law of England and Ireland, let them bring in a Municipal Reform Bill, as was done in the Municipal Corporation Act of 1882—one of those great codifying Acts which have placed the various branches of the English law upon a clear and simple basis. I do not believe that the other Corporations desire to have their franchise reduced. In the City of Armagh, my own constituency, those who are rated under £5 have no votes; but they pay no rates, and when it was proposed to make a reduction, there was no desire for it. But whether they want it or not, whether it is right in principle or not, I venture to submit that nothing should be done which would bind this House to any interference with the franchise of the towns and counties of Ireland outside the Municipal Corporations Act.

\*(1.44.) MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): We have heard many objections to the municipal franchise in Ireland; but I think the weakest reasons ever offered in opposition to this Bill have just been advanced by the hon. and learned Member for Mid Armagh. He has not been very long in this House; but I must congratulate him upon having, within the space of one week, acquired all the stock of out-and-dried objections to Irish reform. This measure has always been, in the opinion of Gentlemen opposite, too small or too big, and the hon. and learned Gentleman considers it too small.

MR. BARTON: My observations had reference to the eleven municipal corporations. With reference to them, I know of no ground of opposition to the Bill, though I would rather like to have them dealt with as a whole.

With regard to other towns, I strenuously object to this Bill.

\*MR. CLANCY: Then it appears I was wrong, and that the hon. and learned Gentleman's objection is that the Bill is too big. But I am afraid that if it were smaller his objection would still remain, for somehow or other the Conservative Party have always found objections to this measure, and we have never got the slightest assistance from the "loyal minority" of Ireland in striving to reform the franchise. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that this was a misleading Bill; but I do not understand the meaning of that objection, for municipal franchise certainly refers to the franchise in towns and townships, and I am surprised that such an objection should have been made. This reform is required in towns and townships, even more than in the cities of Ireland. The facts put forward by the Mover of the Bill are undeniable and overwhelming; but if my hon. Friend had gone into the case of the towns and townships, he would have shown even a stronger case for reform. The hon. Member referred to Blackrock, in the County of Dublin, and no more striking example of the need of reform in townships could be given, for our case may be based on that instance alone. The hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to think there had not been any agitation on this matter in Ireland. What was the meaning of that objection? Does he want agitation? Is no reform to be obtained for Ireland without a Land League, a National League, or a House League, or some other league which may perhaps throw society into disorder? If he does want agitation on this subject he may have it, and I warn him that it will probably extend to the northern parts of Ireland, for the Orangemen will clamour for this Bill as much as the Nationalists in the rest of the country. I do not need to refer at any great length to what I may call the pettifogging objections made by the hon. and learned Gentleman to the provisions of the Bill, for most of them have no relation whatever to its principle, and may be properly discussed in Committee. He asked about the repeal of certain Statutes, and I invite him when we go

into Committee to propose an Amendment specifying those Statutes, for I am sure if he does so there is no Member on this side who will not support him. He objected that we left out some of the disqualifications existing in regard to the Parliamentary franchise, but this Bill does not deal with the Parliamentary Franchise.

MR. BARTON: I beg pardon, but I refer to the municipal franchise, and to the Poor Law qualification.

\*MR. CLANCY: This municipal franchise does not depend upon the Poor Law rating, and unless we dragged into the Bill that which has nothing to do with the subject, we cannot act upon his suggestion. I should have supposed from his speech the other night that the hon. Gentleman was something of a Tory Democrat, and I advise him to remember that there will be more Tory Democrats coming into this House in future, and that proposals for the restriction of the Parliamentary or municipal franchise will be just as hotly resented by those representatives of the working men of Great Britain as by any Liberal politician. I am glad we have not had from the hon. Gentleman any reflection upon his fellow-countrymen, and I hope his example will be followed in that respect by other Members from the North of Ireland, for it has been too much a habit with them in recent years to attack their fellow-countrymen. It has been said that provision should be made for men of position administering the local affairs of Ireland; but I do not believe in their administration. We have had experience of them for the last 90 years, and we find they have landed the country, on every opportunity, in a mess. Thus, at the present day, where we have men of position entrusted with the local affairs of Ireland, we find that there it is, and there only, that scandals in the administration of the law occur. I need not refer to the Grand Juries, because they are doomed, and I believe their execution will be begun to-morrow night. But with regard to Boards of Guardians, it is notorious that the *ex officio* members habitually neglect their duty, and never attend except when there is a job on. It would be false policy even for a Conservative Govern-

*Mr. Dunbar Barton*

ment any longer to maintain the present restriction of the franchise; for wherever it has been extended, the result has been unmixed good to the community. There is not much interest taken now in some parts of Ireland in municipal affairs, because the mass of the people are shut out from the vote; but wherever in England the municipal franchise has been extended there has been a vast increase in the interest taken in the work of the municipalities. Before the extension of the suffrage, very little was thought of the interests of the working man in this House. We had no Agricultural Holdings Bill in those days. We had no Bills for improving the condition of the labouring classes in England, Scotland, or Ireland; but since the extension of the suffrage we are bristling all over with energy for improving the condition of the labouring classes. It is an instructive object lesson in the matter of Home Rule for Ireland to look at the present condition of the empty Benches opposite. The hon. Member who introduced the Bill adduced overwhelming arguments in its favour; but if a Division should be taken Members will come in on the other side to vote who never heard that speech, and a vote given in ignorance is an outrage on justice. This reform has been refused by the House of Commons for 50 or 60 years, and if the case of Home Rule depended on that fact alone, it would be complete.

\*(2.25.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): The Mover of the Bill expressed the hope that no opposition would come from any Irish Member. Perhaps that was too much to hope for, but if a Division be taken to-day very few Irish Members will vote against the Bill. It has been completely proved to-day that the Irish law so far as the franchise is concerned is in a state of hopeless confusion; that the Irish franchise is not the same as that in England; and that it differs in different towns. I should like to ask, Sir, why the Irish householder should not have the same rights as the English householder; he has precisely the same rights as far as the election of a Member of Parliament is concerned. Why is the Irish householder to be

held capable of voting for a Member of Parliament, and yet held to be incapable of voting for a Town Councillor? Why should the Belfast artizan have municipal rights which are denied to the artizan of Cork? There is another strong ground in favour of this Bill, namely, the sanitary state of many of the small towns in Ireland. There is no authority whatever, and if there were no other ground for this Bill I should support the Second Reading. I think the objections made by the hon. Member for Mid Armagh were lawyer's objections, and did not go to the principle of the Bill. The view that the townships which would be affected by the Bill are not seized of its contents is not an objection, inasmuch as the townships are represented here, and the Members representing them are seized of knowledge of what is within the four corners of the Bill. I think my hon. Friend had the idea that advertisements of the Bill should have been inserted in the papers as in the case of a Private Bill. But who is there to object if even that had been done? Is my hon. Friend the Member for South Belfast going to object?

MR. W. JOHNSTON: No, certainly not.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I thought not. It may be thought that the privileged corporations are going to object, but I do not think the House ought to reject the Bill on that ground. I do not think that on the eve of a Local Government Bill, which is to follow English lines and have the widest possible franchise, that the claims of a privileged few should be set up to the injury of the smaller townships. I support the Second Reading of the Bill.

\*(2.35.) MR. MURPHY (Dublin, St. Patrick's): After the speech of the Mover of the Bill, I think, Sir, the wonder is that the present state of things has existed so long. The fact that a somewhat similar Bill has been introduced year after year shows the difficulty of getting legislation admittedly desirable for Ireland passed through this House. The hon. Member for Mid Armagh said he should oppose the Bill, and I must congratulate him on the ingenuity with which he put the very bad case he made

out. He propounded the extraordinary constitutional theory that the House was not competent to deal with the question without the consent of those who already possessed the franchise. I agree with the hon. Member for South Tyrone that the question is of more pressing importance to the small towns than to the municipal boroughs, as their sanitary and other arrangements are far behind the times, and that state of things is not likely to be altered till those who have to live in unsanitary houses are directly represented on the Boards of Town Commissioners. In one town of 3,000 inhabitants in the North of Ireland 119 burgesses return nine Commissioners. In another of the same size nine Commissioners are elected by 75 burgesses. In the City of Limerick there are 457 burgesses out of a population of 39,000. They are divided into wards, one of which has 27 electors and returns four Councillors and an Alderman, or one representative to  $4\frac{1}{2}$  burgesses; another ward has 30, and the largest has only 83. The Bill really does not meet with any very great opposition in Ireland. Nor do I think that it will make any considerable change in the representation in a political sense. In the town of Belfast the number of electors have increased from 6,000, or thereabouts, before the passing of the Municipal Franchise Act to 33,000, and yet the effect of that extension of the franchise has been that it has not made any change whatever in the state of political parties in the Corporation of Belfast. In Dublin the representation is something like 43 Nationalists to 7 Conservatives, and I think that the extension of the franchise would not make any great difference in Dublin. At the present moment there are in Dublin only two or three hundred electors in each ward, and a man can practically get himself elected by requisition before the election takes place at all; and I think if the franchise were extended a great many people of a higher status would come forward and show interest in the matter than they do at the present time. The immediate cause of the claim for the extension of the franchise in Belfast was a proposal for the expenditure of a large sum of money

on main drainage; and the hon. Member for West Belfast showed the unreasonableness of such an enormous expenditure by those who represented such a small number of the ratepayers, and this was the immediate cause of the extension of the Belfast franchise. In the City of Dublin we are upon the eve of an expenditure of the same character, and the same arguments may be used in regard to it. As regards the townships that are adjoining the City of Dublin, such as where I reside, Rathmines and other places, I can say that the majority of the inhabitants without representation under the present franchises. The system prevails in Rathmines and elsewhere to co-opt members when a vacancy occurs in their body. That, I believe, is a state of things which should not exist. If a vacancy takes place in the representation of the municipality the ratepayers have a right to return a man whom they think should fill the vacancy, and I say that it is contrary to all our modern ideas to hold that the remaining members should have the power to co-opt those members. I do not think that I can add anything more to what has been said by speakers who have preceded me, and I can only conclude with expressing the hope that the House will see its way to allow the Bill to pass its Second Reading.

(2.45.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim S.): I think the hon. Member who has just sat down has taken everybody by surprise; he has launched forth into a discussion in which he has dealt with the constitution of Grand Jurors and the Boards of Guardians, and has said that the Bill now before the House is only a continuation of the Bill of last year. Now this is the first time that the Bill has been introduced into this House, and I can only account for the confusion of the hon. Gentleman's mind by the agitated condition of the atmosphere in Upper O'Connell Street for the past few months. I am not making that as an accusation against the Bill; I am inclined to ask anyone who opposes it because hon. Members say the Bill is wide in its scope. So far the operations of the Bill are concern

*Mr. Murphy*

of its powers in dealing with those that were included in former measures brought forward by hon. members opposite, my attitude in this must be governed by what I stated in discussion which took place on the last Drainage Bill. I then said of the Bills brought forward which cover the principles contained in the measure would have my support, therefore I have no objection to the second Reading of this Bill. But as to the question of townships, the hon. Member has made a considerable mistake about it. I do not altogether agree with the views he has placed before the House. I do not believe, I speak of that portion of the Bill which I know best, that there is any considerable desire expressed as a part of the people that there be any alteration in the conditions under which the governing bodies of Town Commissioners are constituted; and I find that a Committee of the House before which every one of these Bills was represented, came to the conclusion in their Report that—

"though the desirability of the reduction of the Municipal Franchise has been frequently discussed by your Committee, the subject does not appear to have attracted a great amount of interest, while no desire has been expressed by smaller towns."

Now, I think I may say that no such desire has been shown in the County of Wick for this alteration. I have not heard of any such desire, nor has it been put forward for the purpose of obtaining more votes at municipal elections. Any change should be made in the manner in which members are elected. It appears to me that the Government are pledged to introduce a measure dealing with the Government in Ireland, the case of smaller towns could more properly be dealt with in that measure, should like, so far as these Town Commissioners are concerned, to retain the liberty of action. Having my position clear, I do not intend, therefore, to ask the House to give any opposition to the Bill. But I think the hon. Member, in referring to the case of small towns, has fallen into one or two mistakes

which I should like to correct. Answering the able speech of my hon. and learned Friend on this side of the House, it was stated that this measure had been always opposed by the Conservative Party in this House.

MR. T. M. HEALY: And so it was.

MR. MACARTNEY: This is the first occasion on which the measure has been introduced.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Last year.

MR. SEXTON: It stood for second reading—Bill 27—last year.

MR. MACARTNEY: I have not looked at the matter carefully up, and I suppose the Bill escaped my notice. At all events, it is not correct to say that the Conservative Members for Ireland or that the Conservative Body opposed any similar Bill in the past to the extent that the hon. Member has led the House to believe. The hon. Member also states that no interest is taken in municipal affairs in these small towns. I do not know what may be the case in the other three provinces of Ireland, but I know that it is not so in regard to Ulster. In Ulster the greatest possible interest is taken.

MR. SEXTON: What I stated was that if no interest was taken it was due to a restricted franchise.

MR. MACARTNEY: I say that the greatest possible interest is taken in those municipal elections in Ulster, and so far as the particular argument goes it can have no force in regard to Ulster in supporting a proposal for a reduction of the franchise. With regard to the drafting of the Bill, I do not wish to criticise it; but I cannot say very much of the Bill as it is drawn, and undoubtedly if it ever gets into Committee it will have to be seriously considered, and a great many important alterations will have to be made in it. I shall reserve to myself the right to consider those matters, and on this condition I am prepared to assent to the Second Reading.

\*(257.) MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (College Green, Dublin): The hon. and learned Member for Mid Armagh has

said in the course of his speech that the people of Ireland would have some reason to complain when they read to-morrow about this Bill. He seemed to think that there was something in it that would alarm them, and spoke as if we were making a raid upon certain classes of the people of Ireland; making an invasion of some precious constitution. He said the people would have reason to complain of the surprise practised upon them, just as if some of their constitutional rights were being invaded by the provisions of the Bill. One would have thought from that speech that, instead of proposing to extend the municipal franchise, to extend municipal rights, in Ireland, we were proposing to rob the people of Ireland of some municipal privilege. I do not think the Irish people, or any section of the Irish people, will entertain that view of the case. The terrible proposition contained in the Bill brought forward as "a surprise," and supported by the wicked Nationalist Members, simply amounts to this—that, as regards their municipal rights and privileges, the people of Ireland should be put upon the same level as the English people. I am surprised at the statements made by the hon. and learned Gentleman in regard to this question, statements which were manifestly absurd. I want to know from the hon. and learned Member, or from any hon. Member of this House, what benefit can come from keeping those restrictions upon the municipal franchise in Ireland? We have had a great extension of the Parliamentary franchise with great benefit to the people of this country; what harm can come from extending the municipal franchise in Ireland? I cannot for a moment suppose that it would be an offence to any persons in Ireland to say that they should be put upon the same level as the English people in the matter of the municipal franchise. Speaking as one of the Representatives of the City of Dublin, I wish to bear emphatic testimony to the fact that there is a very great desire among the working people of Dublin for this reform; and there is a very great desire for the extension of the municipal franchise in that city. Last year the Trades Council, which is

authorised to speak for the working classes of the City of Dublin, passed a resolution asking the Irish Representatives in this House to do their utmost to bring about such a reform as is now before the House. I hold the resolution passed by that body in my hand—

"Resolved, that the Dublin Trades' Council thinks that the time has arrived when the question of assimilating the Parliamentary and Municipal Franchise should be taken up by Parliament, and we hereby ask our Parliamentary representatives to take means whereby such a reform shall be speedily accomplished."

The masses of the people have an interest in the prosperity of the towns and cities in which they live, and I think it is important and very desirable that these people should have a voice in the election of municipal representatives and in the government of their cities. I feel perfectly certain that the same views are shared throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. I shall not go into statistics upon the subject, they have already been quoted in the course of this discussion; they are, I think, astonishing, and I believe the English people will be amazed, when they come to read of it to-morrow, of the difference that exists between the two countries, notwithstanding the suggestion that is so often made that we in Ireland are in enjoyment of the same rights and privileges as the English people. We fail to see any reason why any Party should desire the perpetuation of this state of things. When people have to pay rates, and when they are so deeply interested in such matters as sanitation, the condition of the public ways, and questions of that kind, it is most desirable that they should be allowed to have a voice in the election of their municipal representatives. I believe there is almost unanimity of opinion upon this subject in Ireland, and I rose to testify to this fact, that the people of the City of Dublin are keenly alive to the necessity of such reform as is referred to in this Bill, and in proof of that I refer again to the testimony I have quoted coming from a representative body of Dublin tradesmen upon the subject. These men are an intelligent portion of the people of Dublin, their opinions are bound to carry weight

*Mr. T. D. Sullivan*

it is my duty to give expression to my views in this House.

17.) MR. A. BLANE (Armagh, &c.) : Perhaps this House will be astonished to know that in the City of Armagh we live under a Municipal Act which is no less than 63 years old. I propose posing hon. Members in this House returned to this House upon a franchise 63 years old, I can well conceive that a very considerable portion of the eloquence of this House would be lost to us. This Act was passed in the year 1829, and since that day till one-half of the inhabitants of that town have not had the slightest interest in that corporation. We sometimes hear from hon. Members upon the opposite Benches of what we would do if we had power; during all these 63 years there has rarely been a single Liberal on that Town Council; there has rarely sat a single Radical, and not a single Nationalist.

Parliamentary franchise is just one-fifth of the municipal franchise. It makes five times the qualification to return gentlemen to the Municipal Councils that it does to qualify a voter as a Member of this House. He may not take part in the government of the empire, but of a sewerage rate he has the slightest thing to say. The speech made by the hon. Member for Armagh awakes very nearly on a par with the speech made in 1829 in support of the system by which

Beresfords nominated 12 burgesses annually, and the 12 burgesses nominated the Member for the borough. It was a sort of mutual admiration society, and I assure this House that it scarcely differs to this day. There was not a single Catholic in that municipality represented at the Town Council, no Nationalist, in a town of 10,000 population. Catholics have a slight majority, of any one denomination of Protestants put together, but of the whole combined. What was the scandal that was in that corporation? A meeting was held purporting to take the nominations of the Town Commissioners. That was in the year 1878, a very year in which this House passed the 41 & 42 Vict., which is the Public Health Act. A number of citizens were anxious that

certain reforms should be made in the sanitary arrangements and inspectorships. They had the nominations made; they went before one of the chief Orangemen of the county, the Chairman of the Town Commissioners, to hand in the nomination papers. The nomination papers were handed in by me. He refused them. In the case of 21 Town Commissionerships we only put forward one-third—though we were entitled to one-half—and the seven nominations were sent back to us. I thought it was a case worth trying, and I brought this Chairman of the Conservative Association at Armagh, the head of the Orange Party, before the Superior Courts in Dublin. I got some wooden-headed barristers that brought him before the Courts in Dublin, and, poor as the wooden-headed barristers were, they effected my purpose. The Judges declared that the nominations were accurate, that they were in due time, and they should not have been refused; but still I was prevented having my costs, and I had to pay the costs of my own wooden-headed barristers as well as I could. I merely mention that for the purpose of showing how hard it is for poor men, and humble men in the ranks of the people, to go into the Superior Courts and fight the Chairman of the Masonic Institution of the County Armagh, and Chairman of the Town Commissioners, who is also Chairman of the Conservative Association. It is exceedingly difficult. The Judges declared that these nominations should have been taken, and directed a new election to take place; but, in the meantime, the Chairman of the Town Commissioners had exceeded his term of office; he had gone out according to law. He held a new election slightly different from the other. We again contested only one-third of the seats. Did this man accept our nominations? Not a bit of it. The same Chairman of the Town Commissioners whose term had expired, and who was practically defunct, held a new election. He defied us again. I brought this Chairman of the Town Commissioners to the Superior Courts in Dublin with the assistance of some of my fellow-citizens—I was not rich enough myself to bear the expense. Well, we



contested this matter in Dublin. We found that our wooden-headed barristers had brought us into the wrong Court; instead of bringing us into the Queen's Bench on a *quo warranto*, or something of that kind, they brought us into the Common Pleas Division, and the Common Pleas Division threw us out with costs, plus the costs of the enemy. I mention this thing to show the House how difficult it is for any poor working man in the North of Ireland—in that Ulster they speak about—men who are not ornaments of society, but working fellows, useful men, not ashamed of their work—they are absolutely deprived, these men in the North of Ireland, from having a solitary thing to say with reference to the Corporation. Now, let me say this. The day is not far distant when you will have to abolish qualifications in respect to the election of Members of this House—the day is not far distant, I believe, when we shall have manhood suffrage. It is irresistible, though we do not go so far in this Bill, and we are entitled to merely mention it for the purpose of showing that we are not very extravagant in our demands. The speeches that have been made, and that can be made, against a measure such as this, have been trotted out one hundred times against every reform—either municipal, poorlaw, or Parliamentary—that has been brought before this House; they are old and venerable visages. They had done duty when the Act of 1829 was passing through this House. In the days of Peel the same speeches were made. I hold that people who pay rates indirectly, pay rates in the worst possible way. I say that they pay cent. per cent. more than they pay directly; and if you place any rate on any men, that rate will filter down till it reaches the workers; because, no matter how many ornaments of society they have, these men never pay any rates themselves. They take the rate collector in the right hand and the working-men in the left. They are ornaments of society, but not useful members. If you take the City of Armagh, there are three principal landlords in that City. One is the Church Temporalities Commission; another, I think, is Lord Traragan;

Mr. A. Blane

and the third is Lord Dartford. The property of the City of Armagh is built upon the lands of these men. They do not contribute one penny towards municipal rate, poors rate, county cess, or any other rate. All the taxation falls upon what are called the occupiers, the immediate lessors. They do not pay anything to the municipal rates. Why should not they? All the municipal rate is expended on sanitary appliances, enhancing the letting value of the landlord's land and if any of these unfortunate occupiers or lessors leave one town and go to another—if they leave Armagh to go to Belfast—they do not take the sanitary appliances with them; it is left behind to enhance the ground landlord's value, and if it enhance the ground landlord's value, what is the reason the ground landlord is not taxed? It is because property, as it is called, is organised and is able to defend itself against the poor; and in this House the number of advocates of the poor, the number of advocates for strict justice, are certainly not very numerous. But I think, at all events, the Members for Ireland have done their duty with reference to this Bill, and with reference to other Bills coming before the House. We have done our humble best to improve as far as we can the condition of affairs in our country; and it appears to me that if we had the management of the affairs of our own country in our own hands we would not be now dealing with a Municipal Act 6 years old. This, after all, is not a Party question, because the cleansing of sewers is of as much interest to an Orangeman as it is to us. When ferveraged in Armagh it carried off as many respectable Protestants as it did Catholics. I think we might fairly claim that the Attorney General for Ireland, who is a great power in this House, and who is also I think a countryman of my own—a native of the outskirts of the City of Armagh—I think that we might fairly seize him for the purposes of this Bill. I think this is a Bill that he might support without any danger to the Empire. And if he gives us his assistance in this case I can assure him I will please as many of his Conser-

ive friends in Ireland as it will  
rown friends.

(3.27.) COLONEL WARING (Down,  
): I must compliment the hon.  
ntlemen who have just sat  
wn on the extraordinary burst of  
quence to which they have treated  
upon the matter before the House.  
t really I feel some difficulty in  
erstanding whence all this eloquence  
es, and why it is expended upon a  
ter which, as the hon. Member for

City of Dublin said, appears to com-  
nd the general approval of Irish  
representatives on both sides of the  
use. I look on the Notice Paper,  
I see that there is another Irish Bill  
nding next for Second Reading,  
nely, the Labourers' (Ireland) Bill.  
sibly hon. Members opposite have a  
ficulty in proceeding with the next  
l on the Paper in consequence of  
isions in their ranks, and are anxious  
concentrate all their eloquence upon  
s Bill. I have no objection to the  
nciple of the Bill at present under  
cussion, or the one that follows it,  
I therefore I do not propose to unduly  
long the present Debate by any  
arks of mine. But though I shall  
s for the Second Reading of this  
l, I shall reserve to myself a very  
siderable power indeed of criticising  
in Committee. I think that when  
s Bill comes up for consideration in  
mmittee hon. Members will find that  
would have been better if they had  
ended their time and trouble in  
structing a new Bill. I think there  
s good deal in what has been said,  
s this Bill does come as a matter of  
prise to the smaller townships in  
land. Now, it concerns very largely,  
haps, a number of small towns in  
constituency, and I have not had  
opportunity of ascertaining whether  
not they desire this reform, which  
ears to me to be a reasonable one.  
I do think it is greatly to be de-  
d that I should have an opportunity  
ascertaining what their views on  
matter are, and that we should  
er into this business with full  
imation as to their views regarding  
provisions of the Bill affecting the  
rent localities to which it is to be  
lied. For the reasons I have stated  
ve decided to vote for the Second  
ding of this Bill, but I certainly do

not intend to allow it to pass without a  
very considerable amount of correction  
in Committee.

\*(3.30.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
FOR IRELAND (Mr. H. MADDEN,  
Dublin University): I have listened  
with very great interest to this  
Debate, and I think it has been  
conducted throughout in a thoroughly  
business-like manner, and with  
the utmost good humour on both  
sides of the House, and a number  
of most important facts in connection  
with this question, submitted by one  
side or the other, have been brought  
under our consideration. Now, before  
I formally state the attitude of the  
Government in regard to this Bill  
I would recall to the recollec-  
tion of the House the history  
of this measure. It has been, or, rather,  
a Bill bearing the same title as the  
present Bill was introduced, if not  
earlier, in the year 1889-90. My re-  
collection is not clear upon that point.  
Possibly it may have been the year  
before that, but that Bill dealt, as my  
hon. and learned Friend the Member  
for Mid Armagh has pointed out,  
exclusively with the Municipal Cor-  
porations of the 11 cities. Now I do  
not in the least complain that hon.  
Members opposite have introduced in  
the present Session a different Bill.  
That would be no ground for complaint,  
but I must say that the argument of  
my hon. and learned Friend the Member  
for Mid Armagh is deserving of con-  
sideration at the hands of this House.  
I do not understand him to quarrel with  
the title of the Bill, but, as I under-  
stand the very clear statement of my  
hon. and learned Friend, he points out  
that there have been already Municipal  
Corporations Bills brought before this  
House—that this Bill was brought out  
yesterday or the day before as a  
Municipal Corporations Bill, and the  
natural inference of course was that as  
it was introduced by the same Members  
it was the same Bill—but that on  
examination it was discovered that  
this Bill under the same title is not the  
same Bill, but a very different Bill, as it  
deals with very different subject-matters  
from the Bill of 1889-90.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon.  
and learned Gentleman allow me to  
make one remark? The hon. and learned

Gentleman said to-day that the population of Ireland were taken by surprise because this was not a Bill of the same sort as was previously introduced. Now, the Bill, No. 29, of last Session, was presented to the House on the 26th November, 1890, under the title "Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, 1891," and Section 17 was identical with the section in this Bill.

\*MR. MADDEN: The hon. Member will not understand me as quarrelling with the way in which the Bills have been introduced, but I must point out that that was the only Municipal Corporations Bill that has been introduced up to the present date.

MR. SEXTON: No, no; this very Bill.

\*MR. MADDEN: I think that Bill was entitled "The Franchise Bill," and it never having come to a Second Reading, having been withdrawn before the Second Reading—

MR. SEXTON: We gave the Bill the title, "The Municipal Franchise Amendment Act Bill." The clerks at the Table, according to the usage of the House, put the short title "Franchise (Ireland) Bill" upon the back of the Bill. We are not responsible for that.

\*MR. MADDEN: No. I am not quarrelling with that; but when a Bill having the same title as the former Bills is introduced, it is natural to suppose that it deals with the same subject-matter. The attitude taken up by the Government and on this side of the House has been that, in regard to the Bill dealing with these 11 cities, which occupy plainly a distinctive position—a different position from the towns and townships which this Bill proposes to deal with—the question would be one to be dealt with by the Local Government Bill about to be introduced. Now, as the hon. Member is aware, that Bill is to be shortly introduced, and I do not intend to anticipate any of the disclosures of to-morrow. But I want to make it perfectly clear to hon. Gentlemen opposite that the attitude so taken up by the Government was taken up not in regard to the new Bill, or the Bill of last year, but in regard to the Bill introduced in 1889-90, dealing with the

11 cities. The question then arises, What position should the Government take up with regard to this Bill? Now, I am not prepared, I am not authorised, to make any statement whatever in regard to the portions of this Bill which were not in the Bill introduced in 1889-90. That is a matter which will come before the House in due course. It is a matter deserving of the greatest consideration. But the question at once arises, Does the fact that these clauses have been introduced into this Bill—is that any reason why the Government should oppose the Second Reading of a Bill which contains provisions that are in addition to the Bill of 1889-90? It appears to the Government that is not a sufficient reason for opposing the Second Reading of this Bill. It appears to the Government that the proper course to take is to state to the House that, so far as the scope of what I shall call the original Bill is concerned, we adhere to the opinion already expressed that these cities and large towns occupy a distinctive position as regards local government, and that the time has now arrived for dealing with this question; that probably the House will find that the more convenient and the best course would be to deal with that question in connection with the Bill to be brought before the House to-morrow, but that this consideration does not afford sufficient reason for opposing the Second Reading of this Bill. Therefore, with these observations as to the views of the Government, I am prepared to give my assent to the Second Reading of this Bill without going into any discussion of its provisions in detail at present. I rose to make the attitude of the Government as regards this Bill perfectly clear to the House, so that there might be no misunderstanding with regard to the matter.

(3.35.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I hope the citizens of this country will take note of the declaration of the Government. There is a canal in Dublin called the Royal Canal; it separates Dublin from Rathmines. According to the declaration of the Government the citizens on one side of this canal will enjoy a municipal franchise of the same nature as the Parliamentary franchise, but the

*Mr. Sexton*

moment they cross the bridge then they will be under a £4, or £8, or £10 franchise, under the principle laid down by the right hon. Gentleman so clearly. And yet this House of Parliament is anxious to remove every Irish grievance and to place Ireland on a par with England in regard to all contentious questions. Now, Sir, anything more scandalous, or anything that ought to more shock the Tory conscience, I never heard put forward with so much cynicism by a Member of Her Majesty's Government. And, for my part, I rejoice that now, naked and unashamed, on the very eve of the Dissolution of Parliament, the Government have taken up this view; that so far as the citizens of Dublin are concerned, within the Canal they may have British rights, but those outside it may be subjected to Conservative outlawry, because in some mediæval time in the past there were eleven towns endowed with corporate privileges. And these towns—take, for instance, the town of Clonmel, a small borough in the County of Tipperary: it is to enjoy this privilege; but all the townships around Dublin that have suddenly sprung up into life, and are nearly as much a portion of the City of Dublin as Grafton Street or O'Connell Street itself—though they do not, perhaps, enjoy so much of the distinct civic life of the town—are to be excluded from it. For all practical purposes the view of the Government is this: that all these townships are to be excluded, and are to remain under the old heavy franchise, and those within the city ambit are to have the new franchise with the assent of the Government. Now, that is a position which I think no English Minister—no Minister in the English Government—has ever taken up before; and I hope the Conservative Party will rejoice in being able to defend the principle of the Canal Bridge. It may be interesting to the House to know that even in certain portions of Dublin there is not even a canal, so that the dividing line will be the middle of the street. In the case of the North Circular Road, which bounds the city in that direction, for instance, the inhabitants on one side from one window will be looking at the inhabitants on

the other under different franchises; and that is the great situation now created by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. You would believe from the tone and demeanour of the Attorney General that we should go down on our knees and thank the Government for the very moderate attitude it has assumed with regard to this Bill. I say the attitude of the Government is an inconclusive and indefensible attitude. While the Orange Party, as represented by the hon. Member for Antrim and the hon. and gallant Member for Down, are unable to attack this Bill in any way, the Attorney General proposes to confine the franchise to these eleven towns. Why, even the hon. Member for South Tyrone is with us on this question. The Member for South Tyrone made a speech in favour of the passing of this Bill as a whole; and now Her Majesty's Government are going to the country on this principle: that so far as these eleven towns are concerned, they may have the franchise, but as regards 200 towns, they shall not. As I have said, I regard this extraordinary decision, which I suppose the First Lord of the Treasury is responsible for, as the most valuable expression of the views of the Conservative Party. No exception as to draughtsmanship has been taken to the Bill. No point is taken exception to except that the eleven towns are fit for the franchise, and all the rest of the community is not. We are, happily, I believe, on the eve of a Dissolution. This Bill is a Bill just the same, practically, in all its effective provisions as the Bill introduced by us so far back as the month of November, 1890. I shall just give the House one example of the working of the proposal of the Government. Within the last two months a dispute has arisen in the town of Maryborough as to whether a man rated at £4 was entitled to the franchise or not. There was no list of voters in existence except that prepared by the Town Clerk. The Town Clerk rejected the man's claim to the vote, and there was no appeal. An Election Petition was presented to settle the question, and considerable expense was incurred. So that, therefore, to contest the question of the

right to vote in these 200 towns there is no other legal machinery than a cumbrous and expensive Election Petition. That is the position taken up by the Government. That, in my opinion, is a scandal. The case of Dublin is a pressing one. In some of the townships around Dublin the franchise is £5, and in others it is £6, £8, and £10, and we ask the House to assimilate the franchise there to that which prevails in England.

\***SIR J. McKENNA** (Monghaan, S.): I rise, Sir, in order to dissociate myself *in toto* from the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down. The object of the hon. and learned Gentleman was to discredit any advantage that might accrue to Ireland from a Conservative Government. Personally I am prepared to acknowledge gratefully any benefit tendered to Ireland from whichever Party in the House it may come, and I now thank the Government for acceding to the Second Reading of this Bill, notwithstanding the observations of the hon. and learned Member.

**MR. LEAMY** (Sligo, S.): I think, Sir, the House should now come to a vote on the Second Reading of the Bill, seeing there is no opposition to it.

**MR. SEXTON** (Belfast, W.): I fully acknowledge, Sir, the merits of the Bill have been pretty fully discussed, but I wish to draw attention to the fact that throughout this Debate the Ministers responsible for the Queen's Speech have been conspicuous by their absence. Even the right hon. Gentleman who is now responsible for the affairs of Ireland has only been present during a small part of the Debate.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND** (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): The Chief Secretary for Ireland has been called away quite suddenly. It was his intention to have remained and taken part in the Debate.

**MR. SEXTON**: I do not think, Sir, that the Chief Secretary should have allowed any duty to take him away from this House during this Debate on the first Irish Bill since the right hon. Gentleman took Office. We are told

in the Queen's Speech that the Local Government Bill for Ireland will be framed on the same general principles as in the case of England and Scotland, which means that the occupiers of houses in every city and town will have the right to vote on the question of determining the composition of the local governing body. Where in the Queen's Speech is it suggested that the Government are entitled to make one law for 11 cities and towns, and another law for 200 towns? It is in the small towns that the reforms are most needed, for there the misconduct of the Local Government Board is not so liable to observation as in the cities. What is the work of these Local Boards to be but paving, lighting, and sanitation. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had opposed this Bill, I can assure him that the Motion for the introduction of the Local Government Bill to-morrow would not have passed uncontested. The Irish Members were entitled to say that the Government having declared in the Queen's Speech that the principles of Local Government in England should be extended to Ireland have taken the first opportunity that has arisen to abandon their position.

**MR. W. REDMOND** (Fermanagh, N.): I hope, Sir, that there will be no more talk, and that we shall proceed to the Second Reading of the Bill, and then to the Labourers (Ireland) Bill, in which great interest is taken.

\***THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND** (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am sorry, Sir, that I was unable to be present to announce the views of the Government, but from what I have heard from the Attorney General for Ireland I do not think it is necessary to detain the House. I will only say one word in answer to the remarks of the hon. Member for West Belfast. He speaks of this Bill as though this were the same Bill as was before the House on several previous occasions. That is not the fact.

**MR. SEXTON**: The right hon. Gentleman has not been present during this Debate, and does not know that a Bill practically similar to this was read a second time 15 months ago.

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

**\*MR. JACKSON:** The Government is, of course, bound to deal with the question of Local Government in Ireland, and although we do not propose to offer any opposition to the Second Reading of this Bill the Government must not be taken as bound to support the Bill in its present form in its later stages. Hon. Members will have very soon an opportunity of seeing the Irish Local Government Bill of the Government, and of hearing the views of the Government on the question of local Government for Ireland.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

#### LABOURERS' (IRELAND) BILL. (No. 39.)

##### SECOND READING.

(4.5.) Order for Second Reading read.

**MR. J. NOLAN** (Louth, N.): It fortunately happens, that whatever the hon. and learned Member opposite may think as to the differences amongst the Irish Members on this side of the House, none exist amongst them as to the desirability of improving the position of the labourers of Ireland. In my opinion, it does not matter whether the labourers be Protestant or Catholic, Liberal, Tory, or Whig, Parnellite or Anti-Parnellite, for whatever they may be, I sincerely desire to see them taken out of insanitary dwellings, and placed in a decent home. I hope, therefore, that this Bill will be read a second time, with the unanimous consent of all Parties in the House. I do not pretend that it is perfect, or goes so far as I should like, but I think it will be agreed that it goes in the right direction, and if it should reach the Committee stage, I shall be ready to accept Amendments. I do not wish to belittle existing Acts, but we have ample proof in Ireland that further progress is required. We find in Ireland that year after year the people are flying from the country in thousands, and that at the same time the industries of the country are languishing for want of the very labour which is thus going away. A Bill has already been read a second time this week, which admits that the half-acre allotment is not sufficient, and one of the provisions of

this Bill is, that allotments should be increased from half-an-acre to an acre, and I propose to make that provision retrospective. The 2nd section of the Bill proposes to empower the Local Sanitary Authority to purchase, so as to remove an obstacle in the way of providing labourers with suitable cottages and allotments. I do not suggest that compulsion should be used upon the farmer, but it will be found that there are cases in which the tenants are willing to sell their interests, and the landlord is willing to sell his, and I wish the Local Sanitary Authority to be empowered in such a case to make the necessary purchase, and divide the farm into suitable allotments. I trust that the Sanitary Authority will also provide some instruction in cottage gardening, for it is too much to expect an ordinary field hand to at once develop into a successful cottage gardener. I hold that, as a general rule, the labourers of Ireland are capable of great improvement. An hon. Member of this House wrote a remarkable work about the Irish in America, showing to what great power and wealth they attain; and an hon. Friend of mine has pointed out to me that it was not the cultured people, but the hardy and thrifty working men of Ireland who built up large fortunes for themselves in America. The same state of things prevails throughout the Colonies of this country, and I therefore maintain that the Irish labourers, if they only got an opportunity, would, on a similar scale, do for themselves at home in Ireland what their countrymen have done in America and the Colonies. In regard to the 3rd section of the Bill, which gives power to the Congested Districts Board to provide labourers' cottages and allotments, it will be evident that where the Local Sanitary Authority is not sufficiently powerful and rich to undertake this work, it is well it should be done by the Congested Districts Board. The 4th section provides for the inspection of labourers dwellings during the course of construction. In my own part of the country that work has been done in a substantial manner, but I hear that in other parts of Ireland there is jerry-building in the construction of these

cottages. I hope that all Parties of the House will agree that the sooner this Bill is passed into law the better it will be for all classes; and, in view of the past treatment and the present position of the labourers of Ireland, it is desirable that this House should endeavour to improve their position. I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill.

(4.23.) MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.): In rising to second the Motion, I wish to point out that it is merely an effort to improve, in some few particulars, Acts already in existence in Ireland. As regards Clause 1, the House has practically assented to it already this Session, and the only difference between the clause of the Bill which was read a second time a fortnight ago and the 1st clause of this Bill is that it is retrospective. The 2nd clause of the Bill will enable Boards of Guardians to purchase land under the Land Purchase Act of last Session. As to congested districts, it might strike some hon. Members that in them labourers' cottages are not required, but there are districts, in the North of Kerry and elsewhere, where the exercise of such a power as is proposed to be conferred upon the Congested Districts Board would be extremely useful. Very often the authority knows nothing of the material or quality of the house; it simply sends round an Inspector when the house is built, to see that it has been erected on a certain site. The Board of Guardians is supposed to carry out an inspection of its own, but the result in many cases has been very inferior building. The Boards of Guardians think the responsibility is taken off their shoulders by the Board of Works, and the latter refuses to accept the responsibility, so, between the two, buildings are not properly inspected. The Bill proposes that there should be a regular inspection made by the Board of Works, and that payments to contractors should be on a certificate from their Inspector. I cannot imagine any objection from the Government Benches to that proposal. The Board of Guardians generally have treated the labourers in a very fair spirit, still we ought not to leave the labourers too much in their hands, as they are not

*Mr. J. Nolan*

directly represented on the Board. Therefore, as regards the question of the actual construction being efficiently carried out, it is essential that there should be some outside authority. Some hon. Members may object to the Board of Works as at present constituted, but we are looking forward to a re-construction of that body. I am not aware that any complaint has ever been made of construction under the Labourers' Acts when inspected by the Board of Works. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I second the Motion for the Second Reading, hoping that the Bill may pass through the House without much discussion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. J. Nolan.*)

\*(4.35). MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I am sorry, Sir, I shall not be able to give the same support to this Bill as to the previous one; it is founded on strictly Socialistic principles, and is of a far-reaching character. My chief objection to it is that it seeks to divert the money ear-marked by the Land Purchase Act for the purchase of holdings. It proposes to undo on a Wednesday afternoon practically the labours of a whole Session. The Land Purchase Act allocated the money for a specific purpose, and occupied nearly a whole Session in its passage through the House; and now the House is asked to undo the well-considered work of that time. It may be said that the Land Purchase Act is not working, but I cannot agree that it has failed. I believe all the money will be required for the purposes of that Act, and therefore I am not prepared to support the diversion of any part of it. If anything is to be done for the labourer—and I am the last man to say it ought not to be done—the funds must come from elsewhere. I am still more astonished at the 3rd section. If there was one part of the Land Purchase Act which commended itself to the perfect support of the House, it was that dealing with the congested districts. One and a half millions of Irish money was allocated to dealing with these districts, to be used in ways enumerated in the Act; to those objects

and to the work of the Board the House is now asked to add that of house jobbing. Well, Sir, I think that is a business which the House should not cast on the Congested Districts Board. I think the hon. Member for Meath saw the difficulty. The people living in these districts are nearly all small farmers, and not labourers. If you are to take the £1,500,000 voted for the purchase of their holdings to the building and repairing of their houses, it will not go very far. As the Board has not been at work very long, it is too soon to convert its entire functions. There is another point. Suppose the House adds this to the Board's other functions and they build and repair houses, and then the rents are not paid? Are you going to place this philanthropic Board in the position of having to evict the tenants for non-payment of rent? Under this Bill they would be bound to do so. I hope the House will not impose on the Board either the duty of building cottages or repairing them. Besides, I am not certain that the Labourers' Acts have worked so satisfactorily that the House should add to them without close inquiry. I know there has been great tyranny in connection with them. I know that plots have been taken against the wishes of tenant farmers; very inconvenient land has been taken compulsorily. As I think that the money set aside for land purchase will be insufficient, I am not disposed to take anything from it, and if the labourers are to be assisted, to which I do not object, other money must be found for the purpose.

(4.42.) MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I think, Sir, the hon. Member who has just sat down raised a number of hobgoblins. He says we propose to divert certain money now in the hands of the Congested Districts Board to build labourers' cottages. The Bill is as plain as possible, and says that a discretionary power should be given to the Board to apply the money in this way if they think it would be the best way to use it. It does not compel them to spend one single penny now at their disposal in the way suggested by the Bill. How

this can be so terribly socialistic and revolutionary I cannot imagine. The hon. Member says that the rents may not be paid; they may not be paid to the Board of Guardians or to individual landlords. We have chosen to run the risks in the Labourers' Acts, and I am unaware that anything has happened to condemn that course. The rents have been paid with great regularity. I think the Board will be sensible enough to use the power wisely if it is conferred, and then the rents will be paid regularly. We are continually hearing of the tyranny of these bodies. This is a question in which Party passion should not be allowed to enter; it certainly confuses the issue and the principle of the Bill to drag in controversies which may be right enough under other circumstances, but are out of place in the discussion of such a Bill. I would suggest that we take a Division as soon as possible after the Chief Secretary has told us whether or not he agrees with the hon. Member for South Tyrone.

(4.48.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I do not feel the same alarm as the hon. Member for South Tyrone as to the Socialistic tendency of this Bill. All the clauses are not of the same character, and two of them require careful consideration. I will deal first with Clause 3, which affects the householders of the congested districts. I do not know whether there would be great opportunities for the Board to put the Bill into operation; but I cannot agree that it is altogether outside the scope of their duties, because the Land Act in the sub-section of Section 39 says that the Board may take such steps as they think proper in aiding and benefitting agriculture in the congested districts. If there be parts of those districts where the labourers would be benefitted under this Bill, why should the Board, which has very large powers conferred upon it for raising the condition of the population, be debarred from the duty of aiding agriculture by building cottages? I see, therefore, no reason for conferring on the Board the authority to employ a portion of the



money given by the Land Act. I think Sub-section 2 of the clause should be left out, as it might embarrass the Board. I will explain what I mean. By previous Acts, great powers are conferred on those dissatisfied with the action of the Local Authority in building cottages, and much trouble was caused by their action being supervised by the Local Government Board. I do not think it would be right that the Congested Districts Board should be put into the same category as a Local Sanitary Authority, and be subjected to like harassing conduct on the part of those who are dissatisfied. Then I come to Clause 2, which is undoubtedly a very important one, as it may be open to the objection taken that it diverts part of the money applied under the Land Act. Undoubtedly it does propose to divert a portion of it. The question is, Will such diversion injure the mass of the population of Ireland, or will it be for the general benefit? There are three classes whom this clause affects: the labourers, the ratepayers, and those tenant farmers who are not ratepayers. There is no doubt it would confer some benefit on the labourers. I do not think it will injure the ratepayers. It will enable money to be borrowed a little more cheaply for the building of labourers' cottages, and so would be a relief to the ratepayers. As to those who are not ratepayers, they may say that the Bill does not benefit them; but it does not injure their property. If there is to be a great rush, and if there is any chance of the portion of land purchase money devoted to each county being applied for to purchase holdings, we should have no right to consent to any other class of people coming in and interfering with the operation of last year's Act. Therefore I should like to reserve the right to endeavour to amend that clause in Committee. Subject to that limitation I do not see any ground for offering opposition to the Bill. I know that naturally the views held by the Government may be influenced by other considerations than those which influence private Members. They are responsible for the Land Purchase Act, and they may say that this Bill would interfere with the

carrying out of that Act; but I believe that the main objection of the hon. Member for South Tyrone can be met by Amendment in Committee, which would restrain the Commissioners from assenting to any application which would be an inroad; but with these limitations I am prepared to support the Second Reading of the Bill.

(5.) MR. EDMUND LEAMY (Sligo, S.): The hon. Member who has preceded me has said the money would be expended in building houses for small farmers if this Bill were passed into law; and he also spoke about farmers being content to give sites for labourers' cottages. Now, I regret to say that in a great many parts of Ireland, tenant farmers are not very willing to give any sites at all for labourers' cottages, and it is in fact in consequence of that that it is necessary to allow representations for such cottages to be made by the labourers' themselves. We know that Inspectors have in many cases refused to sanction the sites at all. It has been said that some of the best land has been selected for the purpose of labourers' cottages. I know from experience that in many cases the very worst patches of land have been offered to the labourers by the farmers. I think if half-an-acre of land is to be given at all—and half-an-acre is not much—the labourers should get the best part of the land. But, in my opinion, the very worst has been given. We on this side of the House are very glad of the support which the hon. Member opposite has given to this Bill, and to the Bill which has preceded it, and we hope the Government will follow the same course, and assent to the Bill being read a second time.

(5.3.) COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I wish to say, as briefly as possible, that I sympathise with the objects of the Bill. I do not entertain the views, or the fears, of the hon. Member for South Tyrone, as to the communistic character of the Bill. The hon. Member seems to think that there might be a difficulty in regard to the payment of rent of these small holdings; but I wish to point out to him, and to the House, that by Clause 4 of the Bill the operation of the collection of rent would

*Mr. Macartney*

be very much facilitated. I heartily concur with the objects of the measure, and I shall vote for it if it go to a division.

(5.5.) MR. P. A. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): Now that both sections of the Irish Representatives are in complete accord—for the hon. Member for South Tyrone cannot be considered as representing anybody, since he speaks neither as an Orangeman nor as a Nationalist—I hope that the House will permit this Bill to be read a second time. The hon. Member, if he refer to the Act, will find that the Congested Districts Board has done a large traffic in land. Therefore, this Bill does not introduce any new principle, and it cannot be seriously said that there is any great fear of the Board having to call into use the powers of eviction. In addition to that, the hon. Member for South Tyrone will find that there have been exceedingly few cases in which the labourers have been prosecuted and evicted for non-payment of rent. The labourers are too anxious to get possession of a holding, in fact, to risk the losing of it by the non-payment of rent. I think there is one matter upon which all the Irish Leaders are agreed, and that is that the expense of carrying out the Irish Labourers' Act is altogether disproportionate. Possession cannot be got without many formalities being gone through, and in ten cases out of twelve almost 50 per cent of the expenses goes into the pockets of the lawyers and printers. That is a very important matter. I believe it is a serious omission, and I hope that if this Bill goes into Committee the hon. Gentleman who has brought it in, and the Government, will introduce a clause simplifying and cheapening the procedure of putting the compulsory clauses of those Acts into force. I hope that the Government will give expression to the wishes put forward upon both sides of the House; and I am sure if they do, they will be meeting the desires of a very large section of the Irish people.

(5.9.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think that the discussion upon this Bill illustrates the kind of danger which the House is sometimes subjected to upon Wednesday

afternoons. The discussion upon this Bill in fact only began an hour ago. Several supporters of the measure have delivered very brief speeches, and very moderate speeches; but there appears to be no suspicion upon the part of the great majority of the House that this Bill really raises a most important issue in connection with the Land Purchase Act. In fact issues which the House of Commons were engaged night after night in discussing last Session, and issues which the House took months to determine are now proposed to be upset in the course of an hour's conversation. Broadly speaking, the Bill aims at adding to the existing duties of the Congested Districts Board by empowering it to buy land for the purpose of erecting labourers' cottages, and it proposes the allocation of some of the money deliberately voted last Session for an altogether different purpose; for the purpose of creating small freehold occupiers, and to enable Local Authorities to buy land at a cheaper rate for the purpose of erecting labourers' cottages. I would earnestly ask the House to pause before it assents, in a light-hearted manner, to either of those proposals. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the duties the Congested Districts Board has to discharge are already weighty and multifarious. It is exposed to applications of the most miscellaneous kind; applications from every district within the congested area, all pressing the Board to expend the money allocated to it by Parliament in every possible manner, for the various purposes which, legitimately enough, that Board has got power to deal with. Now it is proposed to add to this already vast catalogue of functions the additional duty of dealing with labourers' cottages along the west coast of Ireland. Now, is it not true that there is, broadly speaking, no class of labourers along the west coast of Ireland at all? I take an agricultural labourer to mean a man who works for weekly wages for a farmer. Does such a class exist in any appreciable quantity along the west coast of Ireland? The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion pointed to one or two places in which it was alleged there were a certain

number of agricultural labourers. If that is so, it only arises from the fact that it is impossible so to draw the outline of the congested districts as to wholly exclude, here and there, minute fragments of land which might not be properly described as congested districts. Is it not perfectly clear to the House, if there were a place in which there were farmers so considerable that they were in a position to have dependent on them a large number of labourers on weekly wages, the district is not a congested district in the strict sense of the word; it is not a district in which the £1,500,000 allocated by Parliament should be properly applied. I would therefore recommend the House not to pass the Bill, certainly in so far as Clause 3 is concerned. There remains the question of the more general powers sought to be embodied in this Bill. In Clause 2 it is provided that the Local Authorities, instead of going to obtain loans for labourers' cottages to the Board of Works, should go to the Land Commission and get some of the £33,000,000 allocated. Some hon. Gentlemen may say that there is no fund out of which we can provide money for plots for labourers' cottages. Why, the amount of money at the control of the Local Authorities is absolutely unlimited. The State at present provides, at the ordinary rate of interest current in such cases, as much money as can be taken up, and as much as the Local Authorities require, for the carrying out of the purposes of the Labourers' Acts, and all this Bill, therefore, does is to enable Local Authorities to obtain this money at as low or at a lower rate of interest than they otherwise could do. And where does the money come from? It comes from a strictly limited fund, allocated by Parliament last year for the purpose of creating freeholders in Ireland. This Bill does not create freeholders. I will not travel out of my way to deal with the contention of the hon. Member for West Belfast with regard to the failure of the Land Purchase Act. It may be thought that the money would not be wanted in Ireland for the purpose of purchasing freeholds, because the Act of last year was a failure. It is absurd to judge of that Act, obviously imper-

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

fectly understood in Ireland, an Act which has been in operation for only six months, and which, during those six months, had for its rival another Act giving money upon terms more agreeable to the tenants than the Act of last year, combined with the low price of Consols, which necessarily compelled this country to charge more for the loans for the purchase of land than it otherwise would. It would be absurd to argue from those circumstances, or to found the conclusion upon them, that the Act of last year has been, or that it is likely to be, a failure. And I am convinced that if the tenants—especially in the North of Ireland—really supposed that anything had been done to diminish a fund deliberately given them by Parliament by an Act passed after the most elaborate discussion, and ratified by the House after full debate—if they thought that this fund was to be taken away from them at the conclusion of a one-and-a-half-hours' debate on a Wednesday afternoon, I think they would consider us to be very poor trustees of the interests confided to us. The Government object to the two main clauses of this Bill—the clauses which unnecessarily and inadvisedly diminish the funds allocated by this House for that purpose. I earnestly trust that the House will not come to any conclusion which would thus hastily and recklessly interfere with the deliberation of the Act which we undertook to carry out in the last Session of Parliament.

(5.23.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast W.): The right hon. Gentleman has asked the House to reject the Bill on the Second Reading on account of the objections which he takes to two clauses. But there are other clauses in the Bill to which he takes no objection. To the 1st clause of the Bill there can be objection, because the House has already affirmed the principle

"Notwithstanding," it says "anything contained in Section 6 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act 1883, and the Acts amending or extending the same, a Sanitary Authority shall have power to provide for a plot of garden not exceeding one statute acre being allotted to each labourer's dwelling whether erected before or after the passing of this Act."

I shall now come to the two objections of the right hon. Gentleman. H

objects to increasing the duties of the Congested Districts Board; but the Bill leaves any increase of duties to their own discretion, and if the demands of the people in the congested districts have been met already, then the Congested Districts Board can have no increase of duties. As to the diversion of the funds, not only has there been an entire indifference shown by the great body of the tenants of Ireland, but out of the £30,000,000 provided only £30,000 has been applied for in the year, and there is no reason whatever to expect that the greater part of the balance is likely to be applied for, so that, therefore, there can be no danger whatever in diverting a small portion of this money for this purpose. I regret the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. I think it was delivered without having taken the feeling of the whole of the House.

**\*(5.28.)** **SIR JOHN COLOMB** (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.): I cannot agree with what has fallen from the hon. Member opposite, that it is desirable to increase universally throughout Ireland the number of labourers' cottages and plots. The real difficulty in the congested districts is this, there you have no demand for labour at all. The people there are really all labourers with allotments, and there is no demand for their labour, and I would call the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill only gives discretionary power in the congested districts to the Congested Districts Board.

**MR. J. E. REDMOND:** I beg to move that the Question be now put.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Considering that this Debate has only lasted for one hour since the time when the hon. Member who introduced the Bill sat down, and other hon. Members have risen to speak on both sides of the House, I think further time should be allowed for the discussion of the Bill.

**SIR JOHN COLOMB:** The effect of the Bill would be to duplicate the machinery in the congested districts. The Poor Law Boards have already power to erect labourers' cottages, and

now you are to ask the Congested Districts Board to do what is in the power of the Poor Law Boards. Therefore, I oppose the Second Reading of this Bill, because it shifts on to a Government Department a duty that essentially belongs to the Board of Guardians itself. It has been said that there has been great jobbery perpetuated in the construction of labourers' cottages by these Boards. I say it is the business of these Boards to check that jobbery and see that the work is done, and I object to the work being shifted to another Department. I think it is a very material change which is proposed by this Bill. I do not see that it is a desirable principle to adopt, and on that ground also I should oppose the Second Reading of this Bill. I think, on the whole, therefore, it would be unwise and impolitic to pass such a measure as this. I think it would frustrate and impede the action of the Congested Districts Board—

It being half an hour after Five of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

#### CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 110.)

##### COMMITTEE.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—*(Mr. Matthew J. Kenny.)*

**MR. T. H. BOLTON** (St. Pancras, N.): I beg to appeal to the hon. Member not to persevere with his objection. There is a general consensus of opinion in favour of this Bill, not only on these Benches but on all sides of the House.

**DR. CHARLES K. TANNER** (Cork Co., Mid): I hope my hon. Friend will withdraw his objection. From what I have heard of this Bill, it is not one which should be opposed.

MR. M. J. KENNY: I beg to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported, without Amendment.

**CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (ESTIMATES, 1892-3).**

Copy presented,—of Estimates for Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March 1893 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 48.]

**CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1892-3 (MEMORANDUM ON ESTIMATES).**

Copy presented,—of Memorandum of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury relating to the Civil Service and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1892-3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

**CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS).**

Copy presented,—of Appropriation Accounts, 1890-91, with Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

**NAVY (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).**

Copy presented,—of the Appropriation Account for the Navy for 1890-91, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

**REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND).**

Copies presented,—of Treasury Warrants, dated the 26th January and the 5th February 1892, appointing Francis A. Fanning, esquire, to be First Assistant Registrar, and William H. Drennan, esquire, to be Second Assistant Registrar, in the Registry of Deeds (Ireland) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

**BANK OF ENGLAND.**

Paper laid upon the Table by Clerk of the House:—

Copy of all Applications made to the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England for Advances of Government authorised by Parliament, from 5th January 1892 to 5th January 1892 [by A

**MOTIONS.**

**LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (WALES) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Bowen Rowlands (Cardiff), Bill to enable owners and occupiers of premises in Wales to have effectual control over Liquor Traffic, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. Samuel Smit, Mr. Philipps.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill.]

**LOCAL AUTHORITIES (LAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Robert Reid (Durham), Bill to enable Local Authorities to acquire Land, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Reid, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Esslemont, and Mr. Compton.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill.]

**CASUALTIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Robert Reid (Durham), Bill to abolish Casualties by Purchase in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Reid, and Dr. Hunter.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill.]

**FEUS AND BUILDING LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Donald Crawford (Glasgow, N.E.), Bill to amend the Law relating to Feus and Leases for Building in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Munro Ferguson, and Mr. Philipps.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes past six o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 18th February, 1892.*

## SAT FIRST IN PARLIAMENT.

The Earl of Portsmouth—after the death of his father.

Daniel Lewis, Lord Bishop of Bangor was (in the usual manner) introduced.

## QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN (the Earl of LATHOM) reported Her Majesty's Answer to the Address as follows:—

"I return you My sincere thanks for your dutiful and affectionate Address, and for your sympathy with Me and My Family in the grievous loss which I and My people have suffered by the death of My beloved Grandson. The assurances of your participation in My personal sorrow have given Me very great satisfaction."

The Address and Answer ordered to be printed and published.

## EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES

BILL [H.L.]—(No. 4.)

## SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) : My Lords, I have a difficulty in suggesting to your Lordships anything new to say upon the subject of this Bill; it has been so completely before your Lordships, and, so far as I know, the universal opinion has been in its favour. I do not think I remember any dissentient voice upon the general principle of the Bill, given the conditions of the law of evidence as it at present stands. As your Lordships are aware, in a certain number of offences the law at present is that a person may give evidence on his own behalf if he elects to do so; and I am bound to say that, since your Lordships passed this Bill last year, one or two cases have occurred which certainly give a very strong illustration of the mode in which the present law of

evidence may be worked. There was one very striking case, in which I think an hon. Member of the other House was engaged as counsel, in which a man was charged with one of those offences about which he could be examined. He gave evidence, and, by reason of the evidence that he had given, he was acquitted before a jury. For some reason or another that I am unable to understand, which I suppose may or may not have been the act of the prosecutor, he was indicted for perjury given on the occasion upon which he was examined as a witness, and I need not tell your Lordships that under those circumstances (although the jury had acquitted him when they heard his story, and he was indicted afresh for perjury for saying the same thing) on that occasion of course his evidence was not receivable. Fortunately, as I think, he was again acquitted; but, had he been convicted, I really do not know what would have been the condition in which any Home Secretary would have been. That condition of things seems to me almost to speak for itself. The other case occurred during last year after the discussion in your Lordships' House. There was an old gentleman, I think 80 years of age, who had been tried and convicted, and had suffered punishment for an offence in respect of the sale of a vessel. The same question was raised by an action, and he was then, but he could not have been on the previous occasion, examined as a witness, and, by consent of counsel on both sides, and with the full opinion of the learned Judge, who tried the case, in his favour, it was admitted that he had actually proved his innocence, and there could have been no doubt that the former conviction, under which he had suffered imprisonment, was wrong, and that, had he been capable of giving the same evidence on the criminal trial, the result would have been different. These, my Lords, are two out of many cases; and I confess myself I am a little startled to find that when the opinion has been so all but universal, and so many times the Bill has passed your Lordships' House to enable all persons to have what most person's sense of justice must

regard as the right to give evidence in their own cases, for some reason or other this Bill has been unable to pass the other House. I do hope, my Lords, at all events, that this Session an effort will be made that it should pass, and that that right should be given which the universal sense of justice assents to, I think, as being the right of every person who is now accused. The only argument, my Lords, that I have heard against the Bill is one founded, as it appears to me, upon the notion that no person ought to be examined as a witness who is charged with any criminal offence. Whether rightly or wrongly, that is not the view of the Legislature. All the arguments appear to me now to be absolutely inconsistent with the action of the Legislature, which in, I think, 20 or 30 classes of offences has now distinctly admitted persons to be examined. Under these circumstances, my Lords, I do not think I can add more to what has been said on the subject. I can well remember a very great Judge, Lord Campbell, on one occasion adopting an expedient which I thought at the time exhibited a zeal a little beyond the law. There were cross indictments between two persons for assault, neither of whom, of course, was admissible as a witness in the case in which he was himself indicted. Lord Campbell swore both juries at once; and the result was that both the accused then became capable of being examined as witnesses. And I remember well thinking—it was when I was very young at the Bar—that, if that was right which Lord Campbell said was to be done, it was rather an indirect expedient for doing that which the law now would permit to be done universally. My Lords, I have only one more observation that I wish to make. The substantial provisions of the Bill are the same as those which your Lordships have more than once passed through the House. There are the safeguards to which I have referred, of the consent of the husband and wife, respectively, being required as the necessary condition of either being examined against the other. And, my Lords, I have to-day received a very singular communication from a very able County Court Judge, who tells me that in, I think he says, four cases this

*Lord Halsbury*

singular condition of things has arisen—which might perhaps throw some doubt upon the propriety of the provision with reference to the consent of the husband and wife respectively. I only throw it out with reference to the passing of the Bill, and whether some provision might be made in Committee. It appears that an adulterous wife has procured a person to personate her husband and forge his signature, and the wife has been incapable of being prosecuted for forgery—the actual forger having escaped. The wife cannot be prosecuted, inasmuch as she certainly would not consent to the husband being examined to prove that the document in question, a promissory note, was a forgery; and the result is that she is perfectly independent of the law, and able to forge as many times as she can get the adulterer to aid her. Under those circumstances, my Lords, it may be a question whether there ought not to be some provision to meet such a case as that with regard to the consent being essential for the husband and wife, respectively, being examined. I think, with that exception, my Lords, I have nothing further to add, and I have now to ask your Lordships to read the Bill a second time.

Moved, “That the Bill be now read?”  
—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD HERSCHELL: My Lords, I need hardly add anything to what the noble and learned Lord has said in favour of this Bill, because I have already on many occasions expressed my view to your Lordships’ House that this measure ought to be passed into law. I only rise for the purpose of expressing the hope that the Government will now press forward this Bill, so that it may pass into law. So far as I know, the Bill might have been on the Statute Book by this time if it had not been for the apprehension with regard to its provisions which exists in the minds of some of the Irish Members, who do not desire it to be extended to Ireland. Now, of course, if the Government have time to deal with the question so as to pass it into law, notwithstanding opposition, well and good; but I would earnestly urge this: that, if that be found impossible, on account of difficulties of time, at all events a measure

which is desired for England, and which everybody feels to be desirable for England, should not be delayed; because, if it passes into law here, and works, as I believe it will, satisfactorily, that will greatly diminish, and not in any way add to, any difficulty of hereafter extending it to Ireland.

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 18th February, 1892.*

### QUESTIONS.

#### INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONFERENCE AT VENICE.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the draft of the Protocol submitted on behalf of England to the International Sanitary Conference at Venice, which had to be withdrawn in favour of propositions submitted by the French delegates, was drawn with the assent and aid of the Medical Department of the Local Government Board, or of any other competent official medical advisers of the Government; and, if not, whether the Foreign Office will in the future provide itself with responsible medical advice before proceeding to draft and issue diplomatic proposals on questions of hygiene, depending for their acceptance upon the accuracy and value of the information on which they are founded?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): The Protocol referred to did not contain any new medical regulations or proposals on questions of hygiene, and it was not, therefore, necessary to consult the Medical Advisers of the Local Government Board

thereon. The Protocol was not withdrawn, as stated in the hon. Member's Question. The proposals submitted by the French delegates were submitted as amendments to the Protocol. All the Departments of Her Majesty's Government interested were consulted in the preparation of the instructions given to the British delegates.

#### FISH LANDED AT BRIXHAM.

MR. MALLOCK (Devon, Torquay): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade from what source the Board of Trade obtains the statistics relating to fish landed at Brixham, given in the Return "Sea Fisheries (U. K.)," Paper 1891 (128), page 20, and how these statistics are verified; if he is aware that all fish landed at Brixham (except an insignificant amount) is sold there, and a toll thereon paid to the Harbour Commissioners; and that the Harbour Commissioners accounts show that the value of the fish landed at Brixham in 1890 amounted to £51,553, whereas the above mentioned Return puts the value at £87,007; and if he can account for this discrepancy?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W): I will cause strict inquiry to be made at Brixham into the cause of the difference between the value of fish landed at that place as returned to the Board of Trade and to the Harbour Commissioners. The total of each of these Returns is correctly stated by the hon. Member. The Board of Trade statistics are collected by a person specially employed for the purpose, who is himself a member of the Harbour Board. Those of the Commissioners are stated to be the total of the Returns made to them by the licensed salesmen for the purpose of fixing the amount of tolls payable by them to the Commissioners. The question, of course, is whether there is any considerable quantity of fish which, although landed at Brixham, does not come into the market there, and so far my information as to this point is at variance with the statement in the second paragraph of the Question.



### IRISH CATTLE TRUCKS

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Board of Trade has decided to recommend the adoption of the same rates for cattle trucks in Ireland and England; and, if so, whether his attention has been called to the fact that cattle trucks in Ireland are smaller and capable of containing fewer cattle than cattle trucks in England, and that therefore the effect of a similar rate per truck for the two countries would be to impose a higher rate for the transit by rail of cattle in Ireland than is at present in operation in this country?

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.), had notice of the following Question:—To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, as the difference of gauge between the Irish and the English railways necessitates a corresponding difference in the construction of their cattle trucks, resulting in the Irish trucks being incapable of carrying with safety the same number of cattle as the English, he will consider the advisability of fixing the rates proportionally?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I will answer the Question of my hon. Friend the Member for Down County at the same time as this. I do not consider that it was proved at the recent inquiries as regards Railway Rates in Ireland that Irish cattle trucks generally are smaller than English cattle trucks. On the contrary, the greater breadth of gauge in Ireland has a tendency in the other direction; but the maximum rates for the conveyance of live stock in Ireland must be fixed by considerations too numerous to refer to in an answer to a Question, and of these the size of the trucks is only one. Of course, it would be my desire that, under similar circumstances, the charges should be no higher in Ireland than in England.

### LABOURERS IN THE ORDNANCE STORE DEPARTMENT.

COLONEL HUGHES (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of labourers employed in the Army Branch of the Ordnance Store Depart-

ment of the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich; and how many of those earn 17s. a week, and how many 18s. and 19s. respectively?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The labourers employed are 865. Of these, 175 are paid 17s. a week, 372 at 18s., 159 at 19s., and the remainder are paid at a higher rate. The men receiving the lowest rate of pay receive an increase at the end of 12 months.

### DR. THOMAS GALLAGHER.

MR. FLAVIN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Dr. Thomas Gallagher, undergoing a sentence of penal servitude for life in Chatham Prison, has become insane?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): The medical officer of Chatham Prison reports that the convict Gallagher is in good bodily health, and exhibits no indications of mental unsoundness, but appears quite rational.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman the date of that information?

MR. MATTHEWS: The information is quite recent; it was supplied in consequence of the Notice of this Question appearing on the Paper.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): The last visit the prisoner received was from a lady from America in 1890, and since that year no letter has been received from the prisoner by his friends or relatives. In reply to inquiry made in 1890 the Governor of the prison said Gallagher would write soon. He has not written since, and I now ask the right hon. Gentleman, seeing that there is a very general impression amongst his friends in America that the convict has become insane, will he allow an independent inquiry to be made by a medical officer nominated for the purpose?

MR. MATTHEWS: I must ask the hon. Member to give me notice of this Question. At present I see no ground for distrusting the Report of the medical officer of the prison.

# THE CASE OF JAMES WALL.

SIR EDWARD REED (Cardiff) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of James Wall, sentenced at Cardiff Police Court to one month's imprisonment with hard labour on the 6th inst., for non-maintenance of his wife and child ; whether he is aware that the wife deserted her home and husband ; and whether he will inquire into all the circumstances of the case with a view to the remission of the sentence ?

MR. MATTHEWS : I have received a report from the Magistrate's clerk, and also a Petition with reference to this case. The facts alleged in the Petition differ essentially from the account given by the Magistrate's clerk, from which I gather that the prisoner constantly and grossly ill-treated his wife ; and that, in consequence of his conduct, she went in fear of her life, and ultimately left him and went to live with her mother until after her confinement in September last, and maintained herself so long as she was able to work. The prisoner sold off his furniture and left his home in Cardiff in April last, making no provision for his wife, although, as I am informed, he had means to do so, leaving her ignorant of his place of abode. When he was brought before the Court on the charge of neglecting to maintain his wife, it appears that he offered to live with her, but as he had no house or home to which to take her, the Magistrate did not believe his offer was *bona fide*, and they sentenced him to a month's imprisonment with hard labour. The conviction was under the Vagrant Act, under Section 14 of which it was open to the prisoner to appeal. Upon this state of the facts, I am not prepared to advise any interference with the sentence.

## RAILWAY TRAVELLERS AND THE NAMES OF STATIONS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green) : I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether in view of the difficulty experienced by railway travellers, especially at night, in ascertaining the names of the stations along their routes, he would endeavour

to induce the Railway Companies to make provision for displaying in each carriage during the journey the name of the station at which the train will make its next stop ?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH : I have no power to call upon the Railway Companies to make any such arrangements as the hon. Member suggests ; nor have any mechanical means been brought under my notice by which the result could be effected.

## MR. CHARLES F. STEWART, J.P., OF HORN HEAD.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has been directed to the fact that, early in this month, Mr. Charles F. Stewart, J.P., of Horn Head, was summoned by the Earl of Leitrim to a Court of Petty Sessions, held at Dunfanaghy, County Donegal, before Colonel Bowlley, R.M., and Mr. Charles A. Ramsay, J.P., for illegally altering the position of a licensed leap net off the Horn Head coast ; whether the Lord Chancellor's attention has been further called to the fact that after witnesses, including the Earl of Leitrim, had been brought to Dunfanaghy on three several occasions, and after it had been proved that, out of 3,482 fish, the total number caught for last season, 829 were taken in the illegal leap net between 10th June and 29th August, Mr. Stewart, on the advice of Mr. Mackey, the Crown Solicitor, who defended him, pleaded guilty to the charge, whereupon the Magistrates decided that the case was one for a substantial penalty, and fined Mr. Stewart £10, and £1 for the 37 days on which it was proved that he fished illegally ; and whether it is the intention of the Lord Chancellor, having regard to these circumstances, to retain Mr. Stewart in the Commission of the Peace ?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.) : I understand it is the case that Mr. Charles F. Stewart was summoned to a Court of Petty Sessions as mentioned in the Question. I understand Mr. Stewart admitted that he had made the alteration in the position of the net, and

explained that he did so in ignorance of the law on the subject. I am not informed as to the intention of the Lord Chancellor.

MR. MAC NEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Stewart's solicitor asked that, under the circumstances, a nominal fine should be imposed; whether the Magistrate said that a nominal fine would not meet the case, and a penalty of £50 was imposed. Now, is Mr. Stewart to be retained in the Commission of the Peace or not?

MR. JACKSON: I cannot add to my answer. I am not aware of the details to which the hon. Member refers.

MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire if, at the trial, Mr. Stewart was not required, under writ of *subpoena duces tecum*, to produce certain documents, which, being obtained, were then withheld and not produced in Court?

MR. JACKSON: If the hon. Gentleman will give notice of that Question, I will endeavour to answer it.

#### KILLYBEGS HARBOUR.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, during the tour of the present First Lord of the Treasury in Donegal, applications were made to him to promote the construction of a pier or quay at Killybegs, and that Mr. James Walker urged on the First Lord the necessity of having a Carntullagh boat-slip on the east side of Killybegs Harbour repaired before it became absolutely useless; whether he is aware that, although in reply to Mr. Warren's repeated applications he received a letter from the Under Secretary stating that the case was "one that would be submitted for the consideration of the new Congested Districts Board" nothing whatever has been done for the locality; and, whether he can now announce that any steps will be taken by the Congested Districts Board in the direction indicated?

\*MR. JACKSON: The question of proceeding with a pier at Killybegs has been considered several times. I do not know what decision the Board may come to ultimately, but probably it will be wise to wait until the completion of

the railway and see what necessity arises for the construction. The repair of the boat-slip is, I believe, under consideration.

#### THE FALKLAND ISLANDS.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies has received several Petitions and Memorials from the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands, urging that, as the leases of Crown lands for grazing purposes are now falling in, provision should be made that no individual or company should hold land exceeding a certain definite limit; whether he can inform the House of the circumstances under which an Ordinance was passed by the Legislative Council on the 29th September, 1890, authorising the sale of certain lands; what was the constitution of the Council on that occasion; and, whether, having regard to the fact that the present Governor, Sir R. Goldsworthy, possesses the confidence of the colonists, the Secretary of State for the Colonies will grant the inquiry which has been so frequently demanded into the administration of the affairs of the Falkland Islands?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron H. DE WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Secretary of State has received one Petition, but not several Petitions, from certain inhabitants of Stanley in the Falkland Islands, alleging that the holders of leases of Crown lands for grazing purposes are occupying more land than is comprised in their leases, some of which are falling in, but are subject to rights of renewal; and praying that such surplus land may be secured for the benefit of colonists other than the existing lessees. The object of the Ordinance referred to in the second paragraph of the Question which was passed on the 29th December, 1890, was to enable the Government to sell to the Falkland Islands Company, certain lands of which they were lessees, at the rate of 3s. per acre instead of 4s. per acre, the rate fixed by a previous ordinance as the selling price of country lands. The Council consisted of the Governor, the Colonial Secretary, the Colonial

Mr. Jackson

Surgeon, and two unofficial members, Messrs. Cobb and Felton. The statement of the hon. Member in the concluding portion of his question that the Governor possesses the confidence of the colonists, disposes of his suggestion that an inquiry into the administration of the colony is necessary.

**MR. MAC NEILL:** The right hon. Gentleman will allow me to explain that I did not refer to the administration as conducted by the present Governor, but under the late Governor. May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to say how many of the members of this Executive Council who sold at under value these Crown lands to the Falkland Islands Company are shareholders in that Company?

**BARON H. DE WORMS:** The hon. Member must give me notice of that question.

#### THE ROYAL CHAPELS, WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

**MR. W. REDMOND** (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works why the Royal chapels at Westminster Abbey were closed on Monday, 8th February, although Mondays are free days of the Abbey?

**THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS** (Mr. PLUNKET, Dublin University): I am sorry I cannot give the hon. Member the information he desires, and I understand the right of regulating the admission of the public to Westminster Abbey rests with the Dean and Chapter. I have no official authority in the matter whatever.

#### CONTRACTS FOR ARMY SOCKS.

**MR. LOGAN** (Leicester, Harborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that contracts for Army socks are being described by the men employed in making the articles as "a curse to the trade;" that an average workman engaged on that class of goods at a handframe earns less than 12s. per week of 70 hours; and if he will inform the House what were the comparative prices for Army socks in 1885, and in 1891, and 1892?

**MR. E. STANHOPE:** My attention has been called to a statement of this kind made before the Labour Commission. How far, if true, it is due to

improved machinery or to preventable causes is a matter upon which I hope light will be thrown by the Report of the Commission. It is not usual to publish contract prices of this sort, but I have no objection to state that since 1885 there has been a fall of nearly 17 per cent.

#### THE CLOGAN GOLD MINE.

**MR. T. ELLIS** (Merionethshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state how many tons of gold ore have been treated at the Clogan Gold Mine, near Dolgelly, from 1st November 1891 up to the present time; what has been the average value of such ore per ton; and what royalty is claimed by the Crown on the product of this mine. Whether he is aware that the royalty exacted compels the lessees of the mine to discard and waste large quantities of low grade ore, and prevents them from erecting machinery and employing labour to treat such ore; whether under the existing terms imposed upon this mine by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, for £100 worth of gold, won at a cost of £80, the Crown takes £15 as royalty, thus leaving £5 to the adventurers for the risk of mining; and whether the Government purpose taking any steps to re-adjust Crown royalties, with a view to the fuller development of the mines of the Crown and the increased employment of labour? I find I have made an error in the terms of the notice in describing the royalty as £15.

**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EX-CHEQUER** (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): I thought the hon. Member had fallen into the error of confusing the 1-15th royalty with 15 per cent. According to the returns furnished from the Clogan Mine, 30 tons 12 cwt. 16 lb. of vein stuff were treated for the extraction of the precious metals between October 24th and the 4th inst., and produced 1,023 oz. 3 dwts. 12 gr. of bullion, giving an average yield of 33·43 oz. of bullion per ton of vein stuff treated during the period. The royalty on this product is at the rate of 1-15th of the value. There is no evidence that the royalty exacted compels the lessees of the mine to discard and waste large quantities of low-grade ore, and pre-

vents them from erecting machinery and employing labour to treat such ore. No complaint about the royalty has been received from the lessees, and the present manager has stated that he sees nothing, as to royalty or anything else, to complain of. Notwithstanding this, the royalty has recently been reduced to one-half (namely, 1-30th) on low-grade ores, with a view to encourage the treatment of such ores; and there is no reason to doubt that the low-grade ores at Clogan will be treated as soon as the rich ore falls off in quantity, as in the case at the Morgan mine. There is no reason whatever for supposing that every £100 worth of gold at Clogan is won at a cost of £80; and it is certainly not the fact that the Crown takes £15 as royalty. The Crown royalty on £100 worth of rich ore at Clogan amounts to £6. 13s. 4d., and on low-grade ore to £3 6s. 8d. The fact that the royalties at Clogan mine have been re-adjusted in the manner stated shows that the Government are anxious to encourage the development of this industry. Re-adjustments have been offered in other cases, and in some they have been accepted.

**MR. PRITCHARD MORGAN** (Merthyr Tydvil): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman having regard to the fact that it is desirable to increase the metallic reserves of the country would he not allow £100 of gold to be produced at a cost of £90 without taking two-thirds of the profit?

**MR. GOSCHEN**: The hon. Member must give me notice of a further question.

#### THE DISMISSAL OF G. L. JEFFRIES FROM ENFIELD FACTORY.

**MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM** (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will inquire into the reasons why George L. Jeffries, employed at the Royal Small Arms Factory at Enfield, as writer, was dismissed at a moment's notice, and without a week's wages in lieu of notice, for writing to Mr. John Black, Civil servant, a letter complaining of favouritism, and petitioning for a rise of wages, which letter Mr. Black is said to have qualified as offensive; and whether it is usual to prevent

a man, discharged from one department, procuring a situation in all others?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: Yes; I will inquire into this case. I have not yet had time to do so.

#### THE CASE OF MR. JOBSON.

**MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM**: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can now give an answer as to the case of Mr. Jobson?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: I have nothing to add to a reply I made to the hon. Member for Camborne (Mr. Conybeare) on the 12th of August last.

**MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM**: I think the right hon. Gentleman then said he would consider the question?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: Yes; and I am afraid I can only say that, having considered it, I have nothing to add to what I then said.

#### CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

**MR. JENNINGS** (Stockport): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Government have received any information of a conference recently held at Washington, between Canadian and United States Commissioners, for the "arrangement of the basis of a reciprocity trade agreement between Canada and the United States"; if it be true that the basis of such an agreement has been settled; and if Sir Julian Pauncefote gave to Mr. Blaine the assurance ascribed to him in the despatches to the *Times* of the 15th instant, to the effect that "Lord Salisbury would consider favourably any request within the bounds of reason which the Commissioners might make?"

**MR. J. W. LOWTHER**: Informal communications have recently taken place at Washington between delegates from Canada and Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State of the United States, regarding the trade relations of the two countries. It was previously stipulated by Mr. Blaine that the meeting should be altogether informal. The Canadian delegates have now returned to Ottawa. As regards the last two questions, we have not yet received a Report from Sir Julian

*Mr. Goschen*

Pamcefote, but I may say that we have no reason to suppose that any such assurance as that referred to has been given.

#### THE CORK BANKRUPTCY COURT.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether the attention of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has been called to the repeated representations of the commercial public of Cork as to the necessity for extending the jurisdiction of the Cork Local Bankruptcy Court, so as to include within its powers the adjoining counties with which the City of Cork is in close commercial relations; and whether, in view of the satisfactory and efficient manner in which the Court has worked up to the present, and having regard to the great economy effected by it, as well in the interest of creditors in dealing with insolvent estates as in the general administration of the Irish Bankruptcy Law, he will now recommend the Lord Lieutenant to exercise his powers of enlarging the jurisdiction of the Court?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. MADDEN, Dublin University): I am informed that representations have been submitted to the Lord Chancellor as to the extension of the jurisdiction of the Cork Local Bankruptcy Court. He is giving the matter careful attention before offering the Lord Lieutenant advice on the subject.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I may remind the right hon. Gentleman that representations have been made during several years. Could he not fix some definite term within which the Lord Chancellor might decide whether there should be an extension or not?

MR. MADDEN: I am only able to give the hon. Member the answer supplied to me, that the Lord Chancellor is giving consideration to the matter.

#### CORK MAILS.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the complaints of the commercial public of Cork as to the shortness of the interval allowed for answering letters between 12.45 or 1 p.m. when the English mail

arriving in the City at 11.45 is delivered, and 1.40 p.m., the post hour for the mail leaving by the 2.10 p.m. train; whether the English mail has recently been accelerated so as to reach Belfast at 9.30 a.m. and Londonderry correspondingly early, and whether it is proposed to confer similar advantages on Cork; whether the Great Southern and Western Railway have offered to make arrangements by which the morning mail would reach Cork about 11 a.m., and the afternoon post would not leave Cork till 3 p.m.; and, whether it is intended to carry out some arrangement of this kind?

\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (SIR JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): Attention has been called to this matter the details of which are described with substantial accuracy in the question, and the scheme referred to is now receiving careful consideration.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when he will be in a position to announce his decision as to the proposed arrangements?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: It is a matter that concerns more than one Department, therefore I am unable to say when the matter will be settled.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I shall repeat the question.

#### IRISH CIVIL BILL OFFICERS.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether, in the measure which he proposes to introduce for the improvement of the Irish County Court system, he will make some provision to improve the position of the Irish Civil Bill officers by increasing the very small salary they are now entitled to?

MR. MADDEN: This matter is rather different from the suggestion brought before me, and with regard to which my former statement was made. I cannot give any undertaking or say more than that I will bring it under the attention of the Government.

#### IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.

MR. CAREW (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, on the 31st December, 1891, five vacancies occurred in the staff of Resident Magis-

trates in Ireland by reason of the operation of the Civil Service rule requiring public officials to retire on their attaining 65 years of age; how many of such vacancies have been filled up by the appointment of District Inspectors of the Royal Irish Constabulary, or members of the Irish Bar; how many had any legal training, and how many were Roman Catholics?

\*MR. JACKSON: Four vacancies have, up to the present, actually taken place among the Resident Magistrates in Ireland by the operation of the age rule. Two of these vacancies have been filled by the appointment of two District Inspectors of the Royal Irish Constabulary, a third by a member of the Irish Bar, and the fourth by a gentleman who had already experience as a Justice of the Peace. The last-named is a Roman Catholic.

#### BOILERS IN HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state the cause of the failure of the boilers of Her Majesty's ships *Thunderer*, *Vulcan*, *Blake*, *Blenheim*, and other vessels; whether it is due to the adoption of double-ended boilers, with single combustion chambers and cramped arrangement of the boiler-tubes; whether this type of boiler has proved safe and suitable for the application of "forced draught"; is the same system being adopted for all or any of the vessels now building; if so, will he say how many; also, how many are afloat fitted with this type of boiler; and whether the boilers of the *Thunderer* and other ships are to be replaced with others; if so, will he state the probable cost of the alterations?

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. FORWOOD, Lancashire, Ormskirk): In the unavoidable absence of my noble Friend, perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer. The boilers of the *Thunderer*, the *Vulcan*, the *Blake*, the *Blenheim*, and other ships have not failed in the manner indicated in the hon. Member's question; but the anti-rattle designer, that they would in to their size give an ex-

Mr. Carew

indicated power for short periods under forced draught, have not in all cases been realised. The trials of the *Blenheim* are not, however, yet completed. The battleships and cruisers constructed under the Naval Defence Act have boilers of a larger proportionate size, and those already completed have passed their trials with perfectly satisfactory results. It is not possible within the limits of a Parliamentary answer to explain or discuss the various theories or considerations of a highly technical character in connection with the construction of the boilers for the Navy, but a full statement on the subject will be made in the Navy Estimates. I may state, further, that experiments and investigations, with a view to overcome the difficulties, are still being made, and until these are complete it is not possible to say what ships will be re-boilered, and the cost thereof.

#### CIVIL SERVANTS OVER SIXTY-FIVE.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer would he give a Return showing the number, and names, and positions of Civil servants over 65 retained in the Service?

MR. GOSCHEN: In the Circular which was sent to the different Departments by the Treasury on December 12th, 1890, together with copies of the Order in Council of August 15th, 1890, it was stated that it was the intention of the Treasury to lay yearly before Parliament a Return of officers whose tenure of service is prolonged after they have reached the age of 65, together with the reasons upon which the Department have asked for and obtained such prolongation.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman what is yearly? Is it this year or next year? We want to call attention to the invidious way in which the rule has been exercised—retiring Sir Thomas Brady, an old and useful public servant, while retaining other Civil servants according to some system of favouritism by the Treasury.

HEN

Let me remind the Gentleman that the rule which exercises such Department

the Order in Council it is for heads of Departments to state or they consider services should be made or not. The Treasury has no objection even if there were the desire, to meet in the manner suggested.

**T. M. HEALY :** Will the right Gentleman state when we shall have this information; then we can make our comments?

**GOSCHEN :** The information is forthcoming in the ordinary way.

**T. M. HEALY :** Can the right Gentleman give us any idea?

**GOSCHEN :** I have promised to turn, and it will be given shortly. I will say more.

#### RURAL POSTMEN.

**SEALE-HAYNE (Devon, Ashburton) :** I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will take into consideration the case of rural postmen, as compared with the established staff, with a view to giving them concessions equivalent to those granted to the London Postmen in July last; and whether I inform the House why some rural postmen, who attain the rate of 10s. per week, are established and others are not?

**JAMES FERGUSON :** I am sorry that I cannot encourage an extension that rural postmen will be on the same footing as the metropolitan; but there are now in the House sundry applications for pay in individual cases, in regard to which I shall shortly decide. I am satisfied that the only cases in which rural postmen, receiving 13s. a week, are on the establishment, are those in which they are debarred from it on account of age or of some other infirmity.

#### AGRICULTURAL RETURNS.

**CHANNING (Northampton) :** I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Agricultural Returns collected in June have been issued in October, and whether the Returns collected last June have been issued nearly three months ago; and the fact that

Returns delayed for several months will have lost much of their value as aids to agriculturists, he can arrange in the future for the issue of Returns within two months after collection?

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) :** In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that it was arranged that the Agricultural Returns collected in June, 1891, should be issued in three stages instead of two as heretofore. A preliminary summary was issued as usual in August, and in October a complete abstract was published showing the acreage under each kind of crop, and the number of animals under each head in each division of the United Kingdom. This statement contains the chief information which agriculturists and others require for practical purposes, and by this means I have been able to place the particulars referred to in their hands at a much earlier date than for many years past. I am afraid that it would be impossible to issue the complete Returns within two months after collection as suggested by the hon. Member, but no pains will be spared to accelerate the issue of the summaries and abstracts referred to, as well as of the annual volume.

#### FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

**MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) :** I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has received any conclusive information as to the origin of the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease at Cowsted Farm, Isle of Sheppey; and whether any other sources of infection than the imported cattle in the metropolitan markets have now been discovered, and are being dealt with? I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can give the House any information as to a reported outbreak of the disease at Hayward's Heath?

**MR. CHAPLIN :** I have no evidence which I consider to be conclusive as to the origin of the outbreak in the Isle of Sheppey. It is known that animals, which were in the London market immediately before the outbreak was discovered, were sent to Sittingbourne, whence frequent communication takes place with the Isle of



Sheppey. But whether the disease was conveyed to the island by animals or human beings I am not in a position to say. No sources of infection have been discovered other than the outbreak of disease, which was detected in the Metropolitan Market on Thursday, February 4th. And I have not the slightest doubt that all the outbreaks which have since occurred in the metropolitan district and elsewhere must be traced to that Market. I regret to say that it is the case that an outbreak was reported to us last night as having occurred upon a farm at Cuckfield, near Hayward's Heath, in Sussex. Six cattle and fifteen sheep were found to be affected. I have ascertained this morning that the disease was introduced by some 20 sheep sent to Hayward's Heath from the Metropolitan Market before the disease was discovered last week. Every precaution has been taken, and will be taken, to prevent the disease spreading from that locality; but I am afraid we must still expect to hear of further outbreaks in the country from the same cause—namely, from animals having been sent into the country from the Metropolitan Market before we became aware of the existence of the disease.

PRINTING OF "THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1891."

MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it is a fact that, in the first issue by the Queen's Printer of "The Elementary Education Act, 1891," in Section 5 certain words were printed which in subsequent issues were left out; whether he can state on whose authority the alteration was made in the Queen's Printer's text without an Act of Parliament; and whether he can state fully the circumstances of the case?

\*THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir W. HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): Certain words, which were struck out, when the Lords' Amendments were under consideration in this House, appeared in the first issue of the Act by the Queen's Printer, and the action of the Department which I

represent was confined to calling attention of the Principal of the P Bill Office in the House of Lords to the mistake that had been inadvertently made.

MR. A. O'CONNOR. When Lands Clauses Consolidation Act passed two or three words were obviously inserted by mistake, they were corrected by a subsequent Act. I should like to know by authority the words in this case eliminated.

\*SIR W. HART DYKE: The words referred to were inserted by a printer's error. The words were in a copy of the Bill sent by the draftsman to the printer, and they were inserted inadvertently. A proper copy of Act, as passed by both Houses, specially sent to the Queen's Printer. It was as a printer's error only, the correction was made.

MR. A. O'CONNOR: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to ask you, Sir, in case of varying and doubtful text or an official issue being made certain words, it is competent any Department to direct the printer to alter the text without the authority of an Act of Parliament?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the proper test to apply would be whether there were any error either here or in the House of Lords. There has been no error. The Clerk in this House and the Clerk in the House of Lords made proper entry, and the defect is purely from an error of the draftsman which perhaps he had been led to. The true record is the signed copy of the Act, which is perfectly correct.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the same thing happened last in the case of the Land Purchase Bill a copy having been issued containing words that were not inserted here or in the other House?

\*SIR W. HART DYKE: I was aware of it.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, Coll): Will steps be taken to destroy all copies printed erroneously?

\*SIR W. HART DYKE: That has been done.

*Mr. Chaplin*

### L GUN PRACTICE OFF PLYMOUTH.

**MILDMAY** (Devon, Totnes): I ask the President of the Board whether he is able to state when the Court of Inquiry the practice of firing in the borough of Plymouth will hold things in Plymouth for the purpose of the evidence of the fishermen, whether the composition of the is finally settled?

**MICHAEL HICKS BEACH**: I no doubt that this Committee will sit at Plymouth, but I cannot say any definite time at present.

delay has occurred in this, in consequence of the resignation of Sir Charles Hall of the Chairmanship of the Committee upon his retirement as Recorder of London. I shall appoint his successor with as little delay as possible.

### RE GLASGOW POST OFFICE.

**GEORGE TREVELYAN** (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Postmaster General what are the arrangements of internal administration on the Glasgow postal authorities since they have communicated through Edinburgh authority; whether the arrangements which from time to time are made in the delivery of letters, in the management of district post offices, in the work and pay of the *employées* of the offices, and in the provision of local postal facilities, will be made on the responsibility of the Glasgow postmaster acting directly under the Postmaster General, or whether arrangements in these matters will be referred to an intermediate authority in Edinburgh; and whether the Postmaster at Glasgow will have the independent charge of financial matters in the district of which he is the postmaster?

**JAMES FERGUSSON**: The effect is that Reports from the Glasgow Post Office concerning the business of the Post Office Department will be sent to London through the Surveyor General in Scotland, as used to be done in the case of the appointment of the postmaster. The Postmaster General will be thus informed simultaneously when necessary, as is the

practice in like cases in other cities or districts in Scotland, instead of by the correspondence which has lately been necessitated. A closer supervision will also be exercised over the accounts of the office. Changes, such as those referred to in the second paragraph, are made, not on the responsibility of the postmaster of Glasgow, or of the Surveyor General in Edinburgh, but on that of the Postmaster General alone. He has to decide what changes shall be made, either in the postal facilities of Glasgow or in the work and pay of the Post Office servants, seeing that they largely involve expenditure. Financial matters have never been under the independent charge of the postmaster of Glasgow, and it is not proposed that they should be so.

**SIR G. TREVELYAN**: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in the case of postal facilities being required in Glasgow, perhaps a matter of small nature, the postmaster of Glasgow will require to communicate direct with the Surveyor General and the office in London?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON**: He might possibly communicate with London, but ordinarily will communicate with the Surveyor General, and, as I have said, there is considerable convenience in that course, because we shall be thus informed of all the circumstances it is necessary for us to know. Small facilities he could grant by his own authority.

### FACTORY INSPECTORS.

**SIR HENRY JAMES** (Bury, Lancashire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the number of weaving sheds requiring inspection under "The Cotton Cloth Factories Act, 1889," and if he could state how many Inspectors have performed the duty of inspection under that Act; and, in view of the fact that the provisions of "The Factories and Workshops Amendment Act, 1891," especially those contained in Section 24, as to giving particulars of work, render necessary a considerable increase in the number of Factory Inspectors, whether any such increase is contemplated for the purpose of sufficiently carrying out the provision of both of the above Acts?

**Ma. MATTHEWS:** There are about 600 weaving sheds to which the Cotton Cloth Factory Act of 1889 applies. With few exceptions, the special duty of enforcing the provisions of the Act has hitherto devolved upon Mr. Osborn in Lancashire. In order to strengthen the administration of that enactment, I have nominated two additional Inspectors, who will, I hope, shortly enter upon their duties. With regard to the question of increasing the staff of Factory Inspectors generally, I can only say that the experience of the operation of the Factories and Workshops Amendment Act of 1891 has not been sufficient to enable me to decide whether any or what increase of the staff is required; but I may assure my right hon. Friend that particular attention is being directed to this important matter.

#### ILLITERATE VOTES.

**MR. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.):** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is in a position to state when the Return, ordered last Session, of the number of illiterates who have voted in Parliamentary Elections since the last General Election, will be issued?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** My hon. Friend will find that this Return has been issued.

#### TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.

**MR. HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.):** I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education to state how many of all the County Councils in England and Wales have voted the whole or part of the money received under "The Local Taxation Act, 1890," to purposes of technical instruction, and to give the same information with respect to county boroughs?

**SIR W. HART DYKE:** Out of the 62 County Councils in England and Wales, 52 are applying the whole sum received under the Local Taxation Act, 1890, to technical education, while nine are giving part only. Complete Returns are not forthcoming with regard to the action taken by the 63 county boroughs; but it is believed that in every case, except

Wolverhampton, the whole, or the whole, amount is to be devoted to technical education.

#### INCOME TAX APPEALS.

**MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal,** beg to ask the Secretary to the sury whether, having regard hardship entailed on persons residing in Bundoran and Ballyshannon compelled to go to Enniskill Omagh for the hearing of their cases, the Income Tax Appeal Commission arrangements can be made for the hearing of these Commissioners in Ballyshannon?

**THE SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSION (Sir JOHN GORST, Chas.)** There are no further appeals to be heard in Ireland by the Special Commission this year; but I am assured by the Revenue Authorities that every consideration will be given to the convenience of taxpayers as regards the hearing of appeals in the next year.

#### TELEGRAPH SUBSIDIES.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Croydon, Surrey):** I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he can give some particulars of the guarantees given to the Government by private persons against the cost of constructing lines of telegraph in the United Kingdom, that is to say, the number and the amount of guarantees last year?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** are at present in the United Kingdom 539 Telegraph Offices open under guarantee, either by single individuals or collectively. The total amount of the guarantees is £19,903 10s. This includes a few cases in which a guarantee is given by a public body, such as the Fishery Board for Scotland.

#### POSTAL FACILITIES.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON:** I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that in many of the Colonies and Possessions all letters are re-addressed free of charge; whether he is aware that foreign letters arriving in this country are re-directed free of charge; whether it is a fact that the whole of the postage on these foreign letters is (under the Postal

regulations) appropriated by the Governments of the countries whence they come; the British Government performing the work of re-addressing and re-transmission free of charge; and whether it is the intention of the Government to allow our own letters, sent from any part of Great Britain or Ireland to another, to be re-directed free of charge?

\***SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** The answer to the first three paragraphs of this Question is in the affirmative. The question of allowing inland letters to be re-directed free of charge has long been under consideration, and I am at the present moment in communication with the Treasury upon the subject.

#### THE NAVAL RESERVE AND THE INDIAN MARINE.

**MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland):** I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists among officers of the Naval Reserve, owing to an Order in Council, dated 20th March, 1891, which grants precedence to officers of the Indian Marine; if so, will he take steps to remove the grievance?

\***MR. FORWOOD:** Certain representations have been made to the Admiralty, due, apparently to a misconception of the circumstances which led to the passing of the Order in Council in reference to these officers. Owing to a recent agreement with the Indian Government, the coast defence vessels previously manned by the Indian Marine will in future be manned partly by officers and men of the Royal Indian Marine and partly by those of the Imperial Navy. It, therefore, became necessary to define the relative *status* of the officers of the two Services, which will henceforth be in close connection in peace as well as in war time; and in consequence officers of the Indian Marine, forming as they do a part of the permanent defence forces of the Empire, were as usual given precedence immediately after the officers of the Royal Navy. As the possibility of the officers of the Indian Marine and Royal Naval Reserve serving together is so remote, any grievance as to relative rank is not likely to arise.

#### CHURCHWARDENS AND OVERSEERS.

**MAJOR BANES (West Ham, S.):** I beg to ask the Attorney General if he is aware that, by the judgment of Justices Mathew and A. L. Smith, on the 4th of February, in the Court of Queen's Bench, in the cases of "The Churchwardens and Overseers of West Ham v. the Fourth City Building Society, and the Fourth City Building Society v. East Ham," the Act 59 Geo. III., c. 12, s. 19 (Stourges Bourde's Act), 1819, is impliedly repealed by subsequent legislation and the Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act of 1869; that this judgment affects not only the large borough of West Ham and the parish of East Ham, but also those of Tottenham, Edmonton, Wanstead, the borough of Macclesfield, and adjoining township of Huddersfield, and other parishes throughout England, who have adopted the Act of 1819, and that a large and specially convened vestry in West Ham last year decided not to adopt the Act of 1869, but to retain the Act of 1819; and whether he will be prepared to look into the matter, with a view to amend the law so as to do away with the uncertainty, complication, and the large expenses consequent upon the many and various Acts relating to the rating of small tenements?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight):** In reply to my hon. and gallant Friend, I have as yet only had an opportunity of seeing the report of the case referred to in his question in the *Times* reports, but, as far as I can judge, the effect of the decision is correctly stated in the question. It is, in my opinion, very desirable that the law of rating should be consolidated; but it is not in my power to make any statement as to whether any legislation with that object will be possible during the present Session. I will, however, see that attention is paid to the point.

#### DISTRICT REGISTRIES.

**MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.):** I beg to ask the Attorney General whether he will state the number and names of the district registries or places in England and Wales where writs of summons can be issued?

\***SIR RICHARD WEBSTER**: Under the Judicature Act Her Majesty may by Order in Council create district registries. On 1st January, 1891, there were 83 such district registries. I will not detain the House by reading the list, but they are set out on pages 346 and 347 of the index of the statutory Rules and Orders in force on 1st January, 1891, which is, I believe, in the Library; but I shall be pleased to show the hon. Member the list if he desire to see it.

#### THE LICENSING OF THEATRES.

**MR. LAWSON** (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in accordance with the understanding last Session, he will move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the law relating to the licensing of theatres and music halls in the county of London?

**MR. MATTHEWS**: The Government are prepared to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the law relating to the licensing of theatres and music halls. The Motion will be made at an early date.

#### THE GRESHAM UNIVERSITY.

**MR. PICTON** (Leicester): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the authorities of King's College and University College have recently petitioned the Privy Council to revise the Draft Charter founding the Albert University; and, if so, when was their Petition presented; whether the Petition has been considered by the Committee of the Privy Council; and, if so, at what date; and whether any public notice of such consideration was given?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: There has been no revision of the Draft Charter as settled by the Committee. The parties were told at the hearing that the Committee would be prepared to consider any alteration of the name of the new University. A Petition was presented by the two Colleges, and the assent of the Gresham Committee and of the ten Medical Colleges accompanied it, praying that the name of Gresham may be adopted. The Committee met on Tuesday the 16th instant and agreed to this proposal.

**MR. PICTON**: Am I to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that no alteration whatever has been made to the Draft Charter except the substitution of the word "Gresham" for "Albert"?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: That is what I stated to the House.

**MR. BARTLEY** (Islington, N.): When will the Charter be laid on the Table?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: I should think in the course of a very few days.

#### THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

**MR. BRYCE** (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer when it is intended to present to the House the Supplementary Estimates for the current financial year, and what Votes are to be included in those Estimates?

**SIR JOHN GORST**: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer these questions, and I have to say that I hope the Supplementary Estimates will be in the hands of hon. Members early next week. There will be 15 Civil and three Revenue Estimates, amounting to £309,936, besides the grants to Scotland and Ireland equivalent to the English fee grant for education.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

**MR. JAMES ROWLANDS** (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether referring to a question asked on 30th July, 1891, with respect to the contract for pouches and belts for telegraph messengers given to Messrs. Hebbert and Co., of James Street, Haymarket, the War Office have made inquiry into the conditions under which the contract has been fulfilled, and with what result?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: Inquiry was made, and it was found that the leather for about one-third of the order had been obtained in a roughly cut-out state from Messrs. Ross. Messrs. Hebbert reported the circumstances, and urged that they had not infringed their contract; but on my disapproval being conveyed to them, they have undertaken not to make any further purchases of the same description.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS: Seeing that is the point of a question which I asked in July last, I should like to know whether, as the Factory Clause has been violated, the right hon. Gentleman intends to take any action to enforce the penalties?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I can hardly say the clause was violated. What was violated was an obligation not to buy any manufactured goods from Messrs. Ross.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS: That is not an answer to my question. The right hon. Gentleman will remember the question I put in July last. I distinctly asked whether it was not the fact that the leather, in a partly-manufactured state, was obtained from Ross and Co., who had been struck off the list of contractors. I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to make the Factory Clause an actual fact?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I am very anxious to enforce the Factory Clause; but in this case there was no deliberate intention to violate the clause. They acted honestly, but under a misapprehension; therefore I do not think it necessary to prosecute the matter further.

#### AN "ANARCHIST" PROSECUTION.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the statements made by the police in the alleged "Anarchist" case at Birmingham, in which a Liberal Unionist gentleman of the name of Cavagna was charged by the police with having explosive substances in his possession, and of being connected with an Anarchist Club in Manchester, he all the time being a Liberal Unionist; if in the Anarchist case at Walsall it is a fact that at least two *agents provocateurs* were employed by the police; and if the employment of these *agents provocateurs* is sanctioned by the Home Office?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am informed that a person named Cavagna was charged at Walsall, under the 4th section of the Explosives Act, with being in possession of explosive substances under such circumstances as to

give rise to a reasonable suspicion that he did not possess them for a lawful object. He was, however, discharged on the application of the Treasury Solicitor. He was not charged with being connected with an Anarchist Club in Manchester. I have no information as to his political opinions. The answer to the last two paragraphs of the question is in the negative. There is no foundation for the suggestions they contain.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: Is it not within the knowledge of the right hon. Gentleman that two men during the course of that case testified that they were employed by the police—one saying that his salary was 2s. 6d. per day?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am not cognisant of these facts.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to answer the third paragraph of my question?

MR. MATTHEWS: I have answered it; there is no foundation whatever for the paragraph.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: What I propose to ask the right hon. Gentleman is, whether these men were paid? I will not call them *agents provocateurs*, if the right hon. Gentleman does not like the word.

MR. MATTHEWS: The employment of *agents provocateurs* is not only not sanctioned, but is forbidden by the Home Office.

#### IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. CRILLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the National School Teachers in District 21, whose schools were examined for results in the month of January last, have yet been paid the fees arising from the said examinations; and, if not, will he direct the Heads of the Education Department in Ireland to cause payment of the said fees to be made forthwith in the cases in question?

MR. JACKSON: I am informed by the Education Department that the fees arising from the January examinations have been paid. I cannot ascertain that they have not been paid in any particular instance; but it

\***SIR RICHARD WEBSTER**: Under the Judicature Act Her Majesty may by Order in Council create district registries. On 1st January, 1891, there were 83 such district registries. I will not detain the House by reading the list, but they are set out on pages 346 and 347 of the index of the statutory Rules and Orders in force on 1st January, 1891, which is, I believe, in the Library; but I shall be pleased to show the hon. Member the list if he desire to see it.

#### THE LICENSING OF THEATRES.

**MR. LAWSON** (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in accordance with the understanding last Session, he will move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the law relating to the licensing of theatres and music halls in the county of London?

**MR. MATTHEWS**: The Government are prepared to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the law relating to the licensing of theatres and music halls. The Motion will be made at an early date.

#### THE GRESHAM UNIVERSITY.

**MR. PICTON** (Leicester): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the authorities of King's College and University College have recently petitioned the Privy Council to revise the Draft Charter founding the Albert University; and, if so, when was their Petition presented; whether the Petition has been considered by the Committee of the Privy Council; and, if so, at what date; and whether any public notice of such consideration was given?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: There has been no revision of the Draft Charter as settled by the Committee. The parties were told at the hearing that the Committee would be prepared to consider any alteration of the name of the new University. A Petition was presented by the two Colleges, and the assent of the Gresham Committee and of the ten Medical Colleges accompanied it, praying that the name of Gresham may be adopted. The Committee met on Tuesday the 16th instant and agreed to this proposal.

**MR. PICTON**: Am I to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that no alteration whatever has been made to the Draft Charter except the substitution of the word "Gresham" for "Albert"?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: That is what I stated to the House.

**MR. BARTLEY** (Islington, N.): When will the Charter be laid on the Table?

**SIR W. HART DYKE**: I should think in the course of a very few days.

#### THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

**MR. BRYCE** (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer when it is intended to present to the House the Supplementary Estimates for the current financial year, and what Votes are to be included in those Estimates?

**SIR JOHN GORST**: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer these questions, and I have to say that I hope the Supplementary Estimates will be in the hands of hon. Members early next week. There will be 15 Civil and three Revenue Estimates, amounting to £309,936, besides the grants to Scotland and Ireland equivalent to the English fee grant for education.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

**MR. JAMES ROWLANDS** (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether referring to a question asked on 30th July, 1891, with respect to the contract for pouches and belts for telegraph messengers given to Messrs. Hebbert and Co., of James Street, Haymarket, the War Office have made inquiry into the conditions under which the contract has been fulfilled, and with what result?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: Inquiry was made, and it was found that the leather for about one-third of the order had been obtained in a roughly cut-out state from Messrs. Ross. Messrs. Hebbert reported the circumstances, and urged that they had not infringed their contract; but on my disapproval being conveyed to them, they have undertaken not to make any further purchases of the same description.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS: Seeing that is the point of a question which I asked in July last, I should like to know whether, as the Factory Clause has been violated, the right hon. Gentleman intends to take any action to enforce the penalties?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I can hardly say the clause was violated. What was violated was an obligation not to buy any manufactured goods from Messrs. Ross.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS: That is not an answer to my question. The right hon. Gentleman will remember the question I put in July last. I distinctly asked whether it was not the fact that the leather, in a partly-manufactured state, was obtained from Ross and Co., who had been struck off the list of contractors. I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to make the Factory Clause an actual fact?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I am very anxious to enforce the Factory Clause; but in this case there was no deliberate intention to violate the clause. They acted honestly, but under a misapprehension; therefore I do not think it necessary to prosecute the matter further.

#### AN "ANARCHIST" PROSECUTION.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Leamington, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the statements made by the police in the alleged "Anarchist" case at Birmingham, in which a Liberal Unionist gentleman of the name of Cavagna was charged by the police with having explosive substances in his possession, and of being connected with an Anarchist Club in Manchester, he all the time being a Liberal Unionist; if in the Anarchist case at Walsall it is a fact that at least two *agents provocateurs* were employed by the police; and if the employment of these *agents provocateurs* is sanctioned by the Home Office?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am informed that a person named Cavagna was charged at Walsall, under the 4th section of the Explosives Act, with being in possession of explosive substances under such circumstances as to

give rise to a reasonable suspicion that he did not possess them for a lawful object. He was, however, discharged on the application of the Treasury Solicitor. He was not charged with being connected with an Anarchist Club in Manchester. I have no information as to his political opinions. The answer to the last two paragraphs of the question is in the negative. There is no foundation for the suggestions they contain.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: Is it not within the knowledge of the right hon. Gentleman that two men during the course of that case testified that they were employed by the police—one saying that his salary was 2s. 6d. per day?

MR. MATTHEWS: I am not cognisant of these facts.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to answer the third paragraph of my question?

MR. MATTHEWS: I have answered it; there is no foundation whatever for the paragraph.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: What I propose to ask the right hon. Gentleman is, whether these men were paid? I will not call them *agents provocateurs*, if the right hon. Gentleman does not like the word.

MR. MATTHEWS: The employment of *agents provocateurs* is not only not sanctioned, but is forbidden by the Home Office.

#### IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. CRILLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the National School Teachers in District 21, whose schools were examined for results in the month of January last, have yet been paid the fees arising from the said examinations; and, if not, will he direct the Heads of the Education Department in Ireland to cause payment of the said fees to be made forthwith in the cases in question?

MR. JACKSON: I am informed by the Education Department that the fees arising from the January examinations have been paid. I cannot ascertain that they have not been paid in any particular instance; but if



the hon. Gentleman will supply information of any such case I will inquire into it.

#### THE COLLECTOR GENERAL OF RATES, DUBLIN.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Executive will undertake not to fill up the vacancy in the office of Collector General of Rates in Dublin (caused by the death of Mr. E. J. Kennedy) until the Corporation of Dublin shall have had an opportunity of considering whether they will avail themselves of the option of collecting their own rates secured to them by the Dublin Corporation Act of 1890? What I wish to ask is, that any temporary appointment that is made should not preclude the question of the salary being raised in case the Corporation do take over their rates.

MR. JACKSON: I do not see that any temporary appointment that may be made can possibly affect the salary to be settled hereafter.

MR. SEXTON: The last appointment to this office was called temporary, but in some mysterious manner it became permanent, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman not to make any appointment, at least not during the next few days.

MR. JACKSON: I cannot enter into any engagement, but I will communicate at once with Dublin, representing the case as stated by the hon. Member.

MR. SEXTON: As this office may be worth £1,200 a year in salary, I beg to give notice that if I find the Government attempting to anticipate the action of the Corporation of Dublin in this case I shall move the Adjournment of House.

At a later stage—

MR. SEXTON: The anxiety felt in Dublin in connection with the office of Collector General of Rates is very great, and I wish to ask the Government, if they do resolve to make an appointment to the office, whether they would consider the claims of the gentleman who now holds the second position in the office. That would get rid of any difficulty which might be involved?

*Mr. Jackson*

MR. MADDEN: I will convey the suggestion of the hon. Member to the right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary.

#### IRISH LAND PURCHASE

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nott Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the rules framed by the Treasury (*inter alia*) to the making of "Purchase Returns" by the Irish Land Commissioners, under Section 33 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act will be presented and distributed.

SIR JOHN GORST: The rules will be laid upon the Table of the House as soon as they are ready.

#### GLEBE LANDS (SALES)

Return ordered—

Showing the Sales of Glebes (in connection with the Session of 1891.)

#### MOTIONS.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

#### LEAVE. FIRST READING.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.): Mr. Speaker, whether I introduce this Bill which it is now my duty to introduce is the most important legislative proposal which the Government have to make during the present Session I will not say, but undoubtedly it is a measure of great complexity in itself, and has aroused the largest amount of controversy in the country during the recess. It will be in the recollection of the House that, towards the end of last Session, in answer to a question put to me by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Longford (MR. T. M. HEALY), I expressed on behalf of the Government my intention to bring in a Local Government Bill for Ireland. And to my great surprise I found next day that this was regarded as a new departure in the Unionist policy, and that I supposed I had taken the course of surprise in thus announcing the intention of the Government. Sir, the Government in this matter

to have forgotten that ever since the formation of the present Parliament, in 1886, and even before that time, the extension of Local Government to every part of the United Kingdom has been a cardinal part of their policy ; and so far from there being any novelty in the intentions of the Government in the views expressed by Parliament last Session, it was a mere repetition of what was said over and over again by gentlemen who have every claim to speak on behalf of the Government. The declarations of my noble Friend the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) in this matter are probably within the recollection of all. I think that Local Government has figured certainly in more than one Queen's Speech since the year 1886. And in the year 1889 I myself, at that time Chief Secretary for Ireland, expressed on behalf of the Government our intention to bring in a Local Government Bill as soon as we had been able to deal with the question of Land Purchase. I attach no special value to my own utterances on the point. I only wish once for all to dispel the kind of delusion which seems to have seized some minds in relation to this matter. I stated on that occasion that I was in favour of extending Local Government to Ireland, and that I hoped to bring in a Bill for that purpose, and, if necessary, in bringing it in, to follow with regard to Ireland the same prudential maxims that had been applied in dealing with the other countries with a view to meeting their respective needs and necessities. That was a declaration of policy which I made three years ago, and I see no reason to qualify or alter in any way the statements I then made. Now, Sir, some gentlemen appear to think that the course of the Government is not justified, and that no adequate grounds have ever been stated why we should meddle with Local Government in Ireland at all. These are gentlemen with whom, in many respects, I have great sympathy. Most of them belong to the Party of which I am a member. But I never noticed that these gentlemen on the occasion of these various statements which have been made in the Speeches from the Throne, or on other occasions,

even thought it was worth while to inform the Government that they dissented from their policy ; and, in point of fact, I was not aware of the necessity of that policy ever being questioned until the matter came to the front in the discussions that arose in the course of the autumn. Whether the policy of the Government is justified or not will no doubt depend upon the view taken of the measure which I have now to introduce. But I think it will be admitted by every impartial person that the burden of proof, at all events, lies with the objectors. We have introduced a Local Government Bill for England ; we have introduced a Local Government Bill for Scotland ; and, if we are not to introduce one for Ireland, it must be because of certain great, specific, and obvious dangers that must attend such a course. Vague generalisations, vague distrust, will hardly, I think, be thought sufficient by this House if we are to abandon a policy which men of all parties, so far as I know, have, broadly speaking, agreed to. No ; if we are to abandon our announced policy it must be for cause shown, and shown with definiteness and precision. I will now proceed without further preface to explain the provisions of the Bill, which I trust the House will, in the course of the present Session, pass into law. But in order that they may be understood, I ought, in a very few words—and they shall be very few—to explain to Members who are not intimately acquainted with the existing form of Local Government in Ireland what the system is, because I think all will agree that, in so far as it is possible, we should graft our new and reformed and altered system upon the system which has been in operation with considerable administrative success for now more than a generation. (Opposition cheers.) I gather from the ironical cheer that some hon. Gentlemen doubt the administrative success of the existing system in Ireland. I cannot agree with that. That the Grand Juries may have been guilty of errors of judgment I do not, of course, deny ; but I think they have, on the whole, administered the affairs entrusted to them with economy and with parity. (Cries of " No, no ! ") I think it cannot

be fairly denied. But without going into the merits or demerits of the Grand Jury and the other Local Bodies in Ireland, let me, in one word, tell the House what the present system is. We constantly hear it described as the Grand Jury system, from which anybody not acquainted with the actual machinery and work would suppose that it was the Grand Jury that discussed and initiated all the work that was done in reference to county matters in Ireland. Members from Ireland know that is not the case. The initiative in no single matter connected with county administration lies with the Grand Jury; it lies with the Baronial Sessions or the County Sessions. These two bodies, one representing the barony and the other representing the county, make their financial proposals to the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury have the power of rejecting or accepting them; they have not the power of in any way modifying them. The House will see, then, that at present the counties in Ireland are governed by a Baronial Presentment Sessions and a County Presentment Sessions and the Grand Jury representative of the county. There is no such thing in Ireland as the parish for administrative purposes. For ecclesiastical purposes it exists there as it does elsewhere. But the smallest unit in existence for the purpose of county administration is the barony. The baronies, like almost all other units of government of long standing, vary very greatly in size. I think there are about 150 in the whole of Ireland. They vary from a very small population to a very large one—from the size of a few parishes to the size of a moderate county. Now, the Baronial Sessions, as at present constituted, consists of the Magistrates of the county and of certain cesspayers in the barony who are elected by a method extremely complicated — (An Irish MEMBER: "Selected.") I leave the hon. Gentleman to define the difference between election and selection. They are elected or selected, whichever the hon. Gentleman prefers, by a method which I need not describe to the House. It is extremely cumbrous, and, if I may venture to say so, extremely absurd. The Grand Jury are

selected practically by the Sheriff of the county, and, broadly speaking, may be said to consist of 23 holders — considerable landholders within the county. It is to the gentlemen that the administration of county affairs is entrusted. As the House knows, in dealing with England we had to deal with a country in which no area at all corresponding with a barony is to be found; and, therefore, it was that my right hon. Friend President of the Local Government Board had to introduce into England a measure a very long and elaborate set of provisions setting up District Councils, and so difficult and elaborate was the operation found to be, that we have not yet succeeded in obtaining Parliamentary time for carrying out the subordinate part of the general Local Government scheme in England. In Ireland we start in a better position. The baronial unit is there. We propose to retain it, and therefore, our Bill would not merely be a County Council Bill, but it would be what, in England, would be described as a District Councils Bill also; and will combine, in one measure, provisions necessary for establishing County Councils, and for establishing those subordinate Baronial Councils which will correspond more or less accurately with the District Councils which we hope to set up at no distant date in England. We follow English precedent, in transferring the County and Baronial Councils which we propose to set up none of the administrative duties, and leave untouched the judicial and *quasi-judicial* duties now entrusted to the Grand Jury. In this we are not merely pursuing what I think is a sound policy, but following the course which the House has already thought fit to adopt both in the case of England and in the case of Scotland. I may parenthetically mention that among these duties which leave to the Grand Jury are all questions connected with compensation for malicious injuries, or compensation for murdering and maiming under the Clauses 105 and 139 of the Grand Jury Act. The members of the County Council and of the Baronial Council will be elected for three years. They will all go out of office together.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

and we propose to follow the Scottish precedent rather than the English precedent in the matter of Aldermen, and not to import into the Irish system the provision which finds a place in the English Act. The Baronial Council has laid upon it, broadly speaking, the duties now performed by the Baronial Presentment Sessions. The County Council will have thrown upon it, broadly speaking, the combined duties of the County Presentment Sessions and of the Grand Jury in relation to administrative affairs. Their chief duties, financially, will no doubt be in connection with the repair, maintenance and construction of roads and highways. But this important difference in the existing system will be introduced: that whereas in Ireland the distinction between main roads and other roads—baronial roads as they are called—is not recognised, we propose in this Bill to recognise it. At present certain roads, called post roads, are maintained at the cost half of the county at large, and half of the barony to which they belong. Other roads are maintained wholly at the cost of the barony. The post road is defined not at all as a main road; but a road along which a mail cart happens to run—a definition which evidently dates from before railroad times, and has no relation to the importance of the roads to be dealt with; or with the propriety of throwing half the cost of its maintenance on the county, or the whole cost on the barony. The County Council will have to decide which are main roads, and which are baronial roads; and as at present the baronial roads will be supported by the barony, the main roads will be supported half by the barony and half out of the rate levied on the country at large. We propose in addition to administrative duties now fulfilled by the Baronial Presentment Sessions, the county, and Grand Jury, to hand over to the County Councils, if they should elect to accept the responsibility, the duties now performed by the Rural Sanitary Authorities. We do not propose to make it obligatory on the county Councils to take over these duties. They may feel that, at all events during the first years of their existence, they have not the administra-

tive experience which would justify them in taking over those duties; but if they desired to take them over, we propose that they should take them over. The county, it will be observed, is in some respects far too large an area for the actual administration of sanitary affairs, and in my earlier draft of the Bill I proposed to give these sanitary duties not to the County Council, but to the Baronial Council. But further reflection convinced us that the barony was not a convenient area in all probability for sanitary work; that it differed so profoundly from the existing sanitary areas that the adjustment of existing burdens between the two would be almost impossible; that the Baronial Council would contain members representing the existing Sanitary Authorities, but ought not, of course, to be allowed to vote upon sanitary matters outside the area of the Urban Sanitary Authority within the barony. And for these, and other reasons, we came to the conclusion that the County Council was the proper body to be responsible for the general administration of sanitary matters, but that it should delegate its authority to Local Committees in convenient areas—those Committees being formed out of County Councillors and Baronial Councillors, who, in the opinion of the County Council, most accurately represented the interests of the ratepayers in the sanitary area which they thus delimit. I will, therefore, only add now, with regard to the duties of the County Council and the Baronial Council, that, in addition to the administrative work now performed by the Grand Juries and the various Presentment Sessions, and the duties now performed by the Rural Sanitary Authorities, these County Councils will be required to appoint members of the Board of Governors on the District Lunatic Asylums, in addition to those appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, subject to this provision—that the number of members appointed by the Lord Lieutenant shall in no case exceed the number now appointed by the County Councils. It is, therefore, possible, under this Bill, that the number of representatives appointed by the Lord Lieutenant shall equal, though it is not possible that they shall ever exceed, the number of those

appointed by the County Councils. At present, as the House knows, the whole number is appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. The justification for giving the Lord Lieutenant this power to nominate a certain number of Governors to the asylum is that at the present moment the Imperial Exchequer pays one-half the cost of all inmates in these asylums. I have no doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be delighted to hand over the whole affair to the County Councils, if they would also take over the cost.

MR. T. M. HEALY: That is out of our own money.

MR. BALFOUR: Nine per cent. is Irish money, and 91 per cent. English and Scottish. They would also have to appoint five members on the Governing Body of the county hospitals. They also have to appoint the Coroner for the county, and on the representation of the Baronial Council the City Councils have power to acquire woods and plantations. I ought to say a word upon that provision, which is without analogy in the English or Scottish Acts. Those who have in their minds our Debates last year on the Land Purchase Act will recollect it was pointed out with great force that one result of selling estates to the tenant occupiers is that the woods on these estates are very necessary often not only for the amenity, but also for the climate and shelter of the country in which they exist. These woods are almost invariably destroyed. I expressed myself at the time, and I was quite conscious of the magnitude of the evil; but it appeared to me quite impossible to remedy it till we had a body who could be trusted, and who had the funds to purchase and power to manage the woods. No such body existed, and I had, therefore, to defer to the present occasion introducing a provision which I hope, if it meet the approval of the House, will prove extremely useful as the operation of the Land Purchase Act gradually extends through the country. The next point on which the House will desire information has reference to the boroughs' relations to the counties in which they are situated. There are in Ireland 11 municipal boroughs and two counties of towns—13 in all; and we propose to make these 13 boroughs

of counties and towns separate counties for administrative purposes, and for administrative purposes alone. In other words, we propose to hand over to them all the powers which in the county proper we hand over to the County Council. The other urban districts we do not propose to touch. They will be merged in, and be part of, for all county purposes the counties in which they are situated, while they will retain unimpaired all the powers given to them by law. I think that is, though brief, yet an adequate account, broadly speaking, of the duties and construction of the bodies we propose to create.

MR. SEXTON: Which body—the County Council, or the Grand Jury—will have charge of the presentments?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Practically we leave the presentments untouched, as they fall altogether outside the area of county administration. That seems the natural and proper course. So far, I do not think that there will be any broad divergence of opinion upon the main principles of the system of county government I have dealt with. I now come to a more difficult and more controversial matter. I, of course, have never disguised from myself that there are large classes in Ireland and in England who look with great alarm and dread upon any measure of the kind I have suggested. I think it is only due to persons who, whether they be right or wrong, certainly have only the general interest of the community, of which they form members, at heart, if we examine in a perfectly fair and candid spirit the fears they entertain. They are afraid of three things, broadly speaking. They are afraid that the new system will result in financial extravagance and possibly corruption. They are afraid that the majority, in counties, where the majority is also very small and is often divided from the minority by a chasm for which there is no parallel, I am happy to think, with English or Scottish experience—they think that that minority may possibly be oppressed and plundered by the new bodies to be created; and they also think that such bodies may travel beyond the duties for which they were called into existence, and may use

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

powers given to them by this House for the purpose of managing their local affairs in order to carry out other objects which, however excellent in themselves, cannot be described as local. Now, I should like to say a word upon each of these points. I am not at all disposed to deny that there is weight and force in the arguments of those who think that the administration of the new County Councils may possibly, in certain cases, be open to the charge of financial extravagance and reckless expenditure. Consider what the great mass of the constituents of those Councils will be. There are a multitude of extremely small occupiers of land whose total contribution to the County Council very often does not exceed 1s. or 8d. or even 4d. If you look down, as I have done, the roll of cesspayers in some of the Welsh counties, you will see multitudes who pay sums as small, and even smaller, than those I have mentioned. It is also true, and must not be forgotten, that unhappily the economic history of Ireland has compelled successive Governments, at different times, to start in certain districts public works which would not otherwise have been started, for the purpose of providing employment and relief. The idea of relief works, therefore, is unhappily too familiar to the mind of a numerically very large proportion of the population in some of these Western Districts. The man who pays 8d. or 4d. a year to the county cess, but who on a new road started in his district might expect to earn 8s. or 10s. a week for certain work in the winter months, evidently, though he be a contributor to the County rates, has inadequate motive for economy in their administration. They have only to give notice to the council on any terms whatever to start roads or new works of any sort within reach of their homes, and they will or may gain infinitely more by the starting of such works than they could ever hope to gain by the most economical administration. I think the House will feel that, under these circumstances, it is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary, to take some precaution that capital expenditure shall not be recklessly indulged in. A great many suggestions have been made

to carry out that object, and every kind of elaborate plan has been brought under my notice. It has been suggested that the County Council should be divided into an upper and lower house—the upper house representing the larger ratepayers, the lower house representing the smaller. It has been suggested that all the smaller ratepayers of the county cess should be excluded from the franchise. It has been suggested that there should be a larger number of *ex-officio* members placed upon the County Council, by which the proceedings of that body would be more or less controlled. I reject all these expedients. I think they belong to the character of artificial safeguards, which cannot in the nature of things stand. I also believe that they will be wholly inoperative to carry out the effects for which they were designed. After all, we cannot have a better object lesson in this matter than the case of the Boards of Guardians in Ireland. The Boards of Guardians in Ireland are composed of one half Magistrates and one half of members elected on a plan by which great preponderance is given to the votes of the larger ratepayers. I do not think that anyone acquainted with Irish administration will say that this scheme has succeeded with Boards of Guardians; I cannot conceive it to be any better in the case of County Councils. Therefore I reject unhesitatingly all these plans which have no precedent in England or Scotland, and would be irritating without being effectual, and certainly would not stand against hostile criticism. One exception only, perhaps, I can make, and that is, that in the first County Council elected under this Bill there shall be four *ex officio* members—the Lieutenant and Sheriff of the County, a nominee of the Grand Jury, a nominee of the County Presentment Sessions, and on the first Baronial Council a nominee of the Baronial Presentment Session. This is, with a slight exception, in strict accordance with the Scotch Bill. This, I believe, will be a convenience to the newly-elected Council, as they will be well acquainted with the business. I do not anticipate from any quarter of the House that the proposal will receive serious criticism.

I have told the House the schemes which we will not accept with regard to the constitution of the County Council, and the franchise by which it is to be elected, and the mode by which its proceedings are to be controlled. Let me now explain what are the plans which the Government accepted in these matters. We propose that the franchise for the County Council shall be identical with the franchise for the Baronial Council, and that both shall be identical with the Parliamentary franchise, with this exception, that it will include women and peers. It will exclude persons otherwise qualified to vote at Parliamentary elections who have not paid their county cess, and it will exclude illiterates. That franchise will, of course, be extended to all the municipal towns which we turn into counties for administrative purposes, with the exception that, as a precedent is set in the cases of Dublin and Belfast, and as the conditions governing urban society differ profoundly from those prevailing in rural societies, we do not propose to depart from the practice which we have already set up in the cases of the two towns I have just mentioned.

MR. SEXTON: What practice?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We do not propose in regard to municipalities to deal with either illiterates, peers, or women.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Do you mean that the new franchise will be the Belfast franchise?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Practically, it will be.

MR. T. M. HEALY: That is not the Parliamentary franchise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not Parliamentary, but it is substantially the Parliamentary franchise.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Belfast has only 8,000 electors.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is a question I will not argue now. It is our desire to assimilate all the boroughs in Ireland to the franchise in England and Scotland, although, no doubt, some minute differences may have to be set up. So much for the franchise to elect the County Council. It will be noticed that by setting up that franchise we sweep away altogether the whole class of precautions that have been suggested

for the protection of minorities and the wealthy ratepayers. Now comes the question, How are we to deal with these difficulties? We think that in Ireland we ought to depart from the precedents set in England and Scotland, and that we ought to have some kind of minority vote. I do not think this House will require to be told that the conditions of Ireland are such that, if you set up single-member constituencies, as you have done in England and Scotland, the minority, whether it be a Protestant minority in the South, or a Catholic minority in the North, will probably have no chance of any representation whatever. Here and there it might be that men of particular political complexion or religious creeds might be gathered together in small communities sufficiently powerful to return one or two members to the County Council. But looking to Ireland as a whole—and I have investigated this question with such care as is in my power—I have not the slightest doubt that if you attempt to elect your Councillors upon the system of single-member constituencies you will commit a most grievous injustice to the minority, and absolutely exclude them from any share or chance of even raising their voices in the Council, which is the body to manage their local affairs. The plan of the Government is to make each barony for baronial purposes a single electoral division. If there are to be ten members for a given barony it will form a single electoral unit, and the members will be elected by minority representation. The county, for county purposes, will be divided into electoral divisions; these divisions will probably not all be of the same size. It would be impossible to frame them so, but we shall form them to be as nearly the same size, and to return somewhere about 16 in each electoral division. We have two sets of elections to deal with—for Baronial Councils and for County Councils. So far as Baronial Councils are concerned, we consider the barony not to be too large an area to be a convenient electoral unit for baronial purposes, and all members of it will be elected in one electoral district. The county, we think, on the other hand is too large an area for one electoral

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

division, and we propose, therefore, to divide it into electoral divisions, each electoral division returning a number which I will call 15, although, of course, in many cases it must be less, and in some, perhaps, more. The mode of minority election we have put in the Bill is not, in my opinion, the best, but it is the one most familiar to English legislation and practice—that already in force in School Board elections. I do not think it the best; but I do think it is very easily worked and understood, and there are very great advantages in doing a stupid thing which has been done before, instead of doing a wise thing that has never been done before. I will observe to the House on this subject that the objections which, no doubt, have been felt to the working of the School Board system in England will not, I think, apply to the same extent in Ireland, because, as I am informed—I have no personal experience, but those who have personal experience tell me—that the great difficulty in School Board elections is to set exactly the full value for the votes, which are tolerably equally divided between the two parties. The denominational party may have a right to ten representatives, and the undenominational to six, and the difficulty is so to manage their voting powers as to get exactly their full amount on the Board. That is not the kind of difficulty which will occur in Ireland. What we want to do is to give a minority, even a small one, adequate representation on the County Council; and I think certain rough justice will, on the whole, be done by the scheme which we ask the House to accept. That is the way in which we propose, not to protect minorities, but to give them a voice in the proceedings of the County Council. I am perfectly well aware that if you are a minority, and especially a very small one, it may be impossible merely by argument to deal with those who are acting oppressively. Therefore, I do not now pretend, and I never have pretended, that this giving the minorities a chance of representation is to be regarded as adequate protection of their rights and interests. In order to do that, other provisions have been made, and the first of these provisions is the right of

traverse. I will remind the House, or that part of the House not acquainted with the right of traverse, that there is at this moment, by Grand Jury Law, a right of any ratepayer to traverse a presentment before a Judge and jury, and that right I shall propose to preserve. Slight modifications will have to be introduced into it, but it is sufficient to say that the right of traverse is maintained in this Bill. The other safeguard against financial corruption or oppression is one entirely peculiar to this Bill, and has no precedent in existing Irish, or English, or Scotch legislation. We think that it is not absolutely impossible, though we hope and believe the possibility is a remote one, that County Councils might, under certain circumstances, use the powers given by the Bill for the oppression of small minorities. We think it possible, remotely possible—not, I trust, probable—that they may be guilty of wilful and persistent corruption, and we think that it is impossible to look at the history of Ireland in the past without thinking that these dangers, remote though they be, have a reality in Ireland which they have not, never have had, and I venture to say never can have, in either England or Scotland. Hon. Gentlemen may differ from me as to the facts; but if the facts be as I say, and I do not think any impartial investigation into Irish history can deny it—I am not disposed to blame the Irish people for it—it will be admitted that that condition of things has arisen out of historical causes, amongst which we, the people of the United Kingdom, must take our full share of blame. Well, I admit that we have not to look to the history of the past, but at the facts of the present; and if the facts of the present are as I have said, it is clearly necessary to provide machinery in Ireland which we have not found necessary in England or Scotland. The question now arises, What that machinery will be? The House is aware that under the existing law governing Poor Law administration it is in the power of the Local Government Board, in cases of malversation, to dissolve a Board of Guardians, and substitute paid guardians for them. I do not think the Local Government Board is either strong enough or, in



other respects, well enough informed, to deal with such bodies as the County Councils and Baronial Councils; and instead of attempting to throw either on the Lord Lieutenant or the Privy Council, or the Local Government Board, the power of dissolving a County Council, we have adopted a plan not open, I think, to the objections which might be urged against all the schemes I have just adverted to. Under the Bill, on application being made by 20 cesspayers of the county to a Judge of Assize for leave to petition for the removal of the Council of the county or barony, on the ground that the Council has been guilty of persistent disobedience to the law, or of corruption, or of malversation, or of oppression, the Judge, if a *prima facie* case be shown, shall give leave; and when the Petition is presented, the Judges on the rota of Election Petitions are to try it like an Election Petition; and if they find the Council guilty, the Councillors then in office are to be removed, and their places filled up by persons only approved by the Lord Lieutenant. (Laughter.) If I may gather from the uproarious laughter of the right hon. Member for Derby, this is a suggestion which affords him peculiar and unmixed enjoyment. I gather also from signs in the House that it does not meet with universal approval upon the other side of the House, and I refrain at the present moment from arguing our view of the case, which I shall have no difficulty in defending when the proper time comes. These powers given to the Election Petition Judges are certainly not greater than the power they have already, which is practically that of disfranchising a constituency; and these powers are never to be exercised, except in the cases I have specified—of persistent disobedience, corruption, or oppression. Now, of course, it may be open to hon. Gentlemen to say no Irish County Council could ever be guilty of either malversation or oppression, and if they never are guilty, of course the provision in the Bill will remain a dead letter. Supposing the impossible case of malversation is proved, do hon. Gentlemen opposite desire that it should go on unpunished? Do they desire that the powers given to the County Council for

certain purposes should be deliberately used by them for the purpose of oppressing the minority?

MR. M. KENNY: What about England? Are we not as good as you?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If there be in the mind of any Member of this House the idea that oppression is possible, it is the bounden duty of this House to provide that it should be remedied; and for my own part, without venturing to foresee what the judgment of the House may be, I say that if you will examine the history of Irish controversy in the last ten years, leaving out its previous record, you will find ample material to show that dangers exist in that country which do not exist in England and Scotland, and the House would be guilty of the gravest dereliction of duty unless it provided ample protection against these evils. There is one other, and, I think, a much more important safeguard. I am disposed to think, especially if a plan like that I have suggested be adopted, no County Council will venture to abuse its powers. That I believe, but I do not believe with the same confidence that it may not indulge in reckless expenditure of the kind I have indicated, in the shape of unnecessary roads and unnecessary works, and I think something should be done to deal with that peculiar peril. Here I follow out the analogy, as nearly as may be, of the Scotch Act. The Scotch Act provides that as the owners of land have an interest in the ultimate incidence of the votes, as great or even greater than the occupier, they should have some share in declaring what capital expenditure, as distinguished from current expenditure, should or should not be permitted. If hon. Gentlemen will make themselves acquainted with the mode of procedure of the Fair Rent Commissioners; if they will look at the schedule which is given to the sub-Commissioners for the purpose of enabling them to fix fair rents, they can see that the amount of county cess is, as it ought to be, an element taken into account in determining fair rent. Fair rents are to be fixed every 15 years, and every 15 years the tenants can throw on the owner of the land the whole of the county cess payable at that date. Therefore, although he is not directly a

Mr. A. J. Balfour

cesspayer, he is deeply interested in the economical management of county affairs, as far as capital expenditure and loans are concerned. The Scotch Act provides that there shall be seven nominees of what in Scotland are called heritors, seven nominees of Commissioners of Supply, seven of the County Council, and the Sheriff of the County, and that this body shall have control over the capital expenditure and charges of a permanent character. Unfortunately, we have no official in Ireland corresponding to the Scotch Sheriff; I wish we had. But I have not been able to find, or, so far, to create a corresponding personage, and I have put upon this Joint Committee the Sheriff of the County. I am not wholly satisfied with the substitution, but I may be able to devise some expedient more satisfactory to my own mind. The principal question is the construction of the Joint Committee, the consent of which we propose should be obtained to capital expenditure on roads, new offices, in addition to those sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and for all purposes of a similar kind. It is framed, apart from the Sheriff, exactly on the model of the Scotch Act—seven nominees of the Grand Jury, and seven of the County Council. It may not be good enough for Ireland, but it has been found quite good enough for Scotland. It will be only necessary for me to add, in order to explain the provisions of the Bill, that the present secretaries of Grand Juries follow the English and Scotch analogy, being at the service of the Joint Committee, and will also have to act officially to both the County Council and the Joint Committee; will be appointed by the County Council, and will not be dismissible except with the consent of the Joint Committee, and that the rights of existing officers are provided for; and that, of course, the County Council is given, in the appointment of future officers, absolute power both in regard to appointments, applications, and dismissals. There is only one more danger which I have heard adverted to by critics of a Local Government Bill for Ireland. They tell us—these critics that I allude to—tell us that the County Council can

be, and will be, made the centre of some political agitation; that it can be, and will be, used as an instrument not for looking after rates or for dealing with sanitary questions, but to further the particular views of a particular Party in Ireland. Well, Sir, I confess I have exercised my imagination as far as I could to discover how this danger would arise, and I am utterly unable to see it. I do not doubt that the County Councils like other Boards in Ireland, and like Boards in England too, may occasionally pass, and very likely will pass, extremely foolish resolutions; that they will forward these resolutions to the Government of the day; that they will be quoted in this House; and that, whatever weight can be attached to them, and whatever assistance can be drawn from them, will be freely availed of by hon. Gentlemen holding the same opinions as the majority party who are members of the County Council. But I cannot, for the life of me, understand how that can affect, for good or evil, the prospects of any particular measure to be discussed in this House. It may be—I hope it will not be, but it may be—that these County Councils will be elected on political lines. If so, undoubtedly the majority of these County Councils will be of the same complexion as the Parliamentary Representatives of that particular county; but how the voice of the County Councils will add anything to the weight of the elected Member of Parliament I am utterly unable to understand. The elected Member of Parliament is elected to express the political views of his constituents. He does so with an authority which no one can gainsay in this House. But the County Council is elected for entirely different purposes, and this House would look not to it, but to the Members of Parliament, for an expression of the political views of the county itself. I cannot help thinking that those gentlemen who fear that in passing this Bill for Local Government in Ireland we are not passing a measure for Local Government in Ireland, but that we are passing a measure which is to be used as a stepping-stone to something which has nothing to do, which will have nothing to do, with Local Government,

are disquieting themselves in vain. I do not believe, whatever dangers or difficulties may attach to the establishment of a system of Local Government in Ireland, that that particular danger is one of them, and I would venture to ask those gentlemen who criticise the Bill from that point of view to argue out in their own minds what is the exact nature of the danger which they fear. If they do, I am convinced they will come to the conclusion that the danger has no existence outside their own imagination. I have explained to the House, I hope with lucidity and at greater length than I had hoped to have done, all the complex principles of this measure.

An hon. MEMBER (on the Irish Benches): What about the police?

Another hon. MEMBER: What about the rates?

MR. MAURICE HEALY: What about the Sanitary Authorities?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Police I do not touch. The incidence of rates remains as it is; the Sanitary Authorities are not touched; the Sanitary Committees appointed in the urban sanitary districts are not touched at all. I have nothing, I think, to add to the outline I have given to the House. I hope the House will wait until they see that outline filled in in detail; and hon. Members will wait until they have the Bill in their hands. It is for the most part drawn up on the line of the English and Scotch Bill, and the far greater part they will find in one or other of these Bills, not only the model for the proposals which we have adopted, but also the very words in which they are quoted in the parent measures. I do not know, Sir, that I need say anything upon the general question of Local Government in Ireland. I have been accused of showing a vast indifference to my own proposals, and I have been accused of cynicism in my remarks in regard to them, though I do not know what that accusation means. I have always said upon this subject exactly what I think. I have not pretended, nor do I pretend now, to say that either this Bill, or any other Bill dealing with County Councils, is likely to regenerate Ireland.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

I do not believe that, under the bodies, county affairs will in Ireland be administered more economically or more independently; but I most sincerely think that the execution of these duties of County Councils are a right which the Irish taxpayer has a claim to, after what has been done in England and Scotland. I also believe that at the first, in the long run, the effect of a Bill of this kind will be to bring the various classes in Ireland more together, to associate them more for a common object. While I have provided in the Bill for a condition of Irish society which has little or no parallel in England or Scotland, I refuse to believe that condition is likely to be eternal, and, as time operates upon the wounds that have been seared on the face of Ireland, I hope—I believe—that we may find the representatives of the rich and poor, the landlords and occupiers, the large cesspayer and small cesspayer, the Protestant and Catholic, meeting together as in England and Scotland, and, irrespective of their political differences, working in common, for their own good administration of their own district. If that be the result of this Bill, it will be a valuable result. I do not pretend to class this measure of importance with other Irish measures of which I have had the conduct, or of which this House has passed into law. I do not think it is nearly so important for the administration of justice as the Criminal Law Procedure Act, nor that it is so important for the amelioration of the condition of the country as the Railway Bill; I do think that it is of the same importance as measures dealing with congested districts. I do not think that it will substitute for a state of society a good state of society, which I trust, in the long run, the Land Purchase Bill will substitute, although I do not think it in importance with any of the measures—for I do not anticipate it any, so far as Ireland is concerned—of the advantages which she has derived from any of the four Bills which I have referred to—yet the holding of it from Ireland, after sending it to England and Scotland, is

have the effect of giving the people of Ireland ground for the declaration that they are not treated with equal justice; and for that reason I think the effect of it will be, not to widen, but to help to heal, the prejudices which unfortunately exist in Ireland, and for these reasons I urge it earnestly upon the attention of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Law relating to Local Government in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith."

(5.40.) MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Gentleman had no reason whatever to apologise to the House for the manner in which he has introduced the Bill. The Bill could not have been presented to the House with greater clearness, with more lucidity, or with more admirable frankness. It is the first time that any Minister, in any country, has prefaced the introduction of a Bill for extending Local Government with an avowed preference for a Coercion Act. Now, I confess that I am disappointed in the Bill. Our position—the position of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the rest of us—has practically been from the very first to welcome any measure pointing in a liberal conciliatory direction towards the people of Ireland without compromising or abandoning our own firm opinion, which is, that reform of county and administrative bodies is hopelessly insufficient to meet either the constitutional demands or the social requirements of Ireland. And our opinion further is, that, unless your plan of reformation is constructed on an almost unattainable scale, it will not lessen, but that it will increase the difficulties of better government in Ireland. Though we hold these opinions, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, in a very early stage in the existence of the present Parliament, expressly admitted that the Government might be expected to bring in a Bill of this kind. I now, to-night, admit that the Government have a full right to ask us, at this stage, at any rate, to examine their proposals as they stand, and on their merits, with a view for the special objects

and ends which they have set out for themselves in framing that measure, and independently of the value of this measure as an alternative policy to Home Rule. We admit the truth of that. The Government have a right, in the first instance, to invite us to discuss that measure from their own starting-point—namely, that it is not desirable, in their judgment, to trust the people of Ireland with a central elective authority; but that it is desirable, and that it is safe to entrust local representative bodies—this I take to be the first principle—to entrust local representative bodies with the same powers as has been conferred upon local representative bodies in England. (Hear, hear!) The right hon. Gentleman assents I see to that. Has he carried that principle out? I will examine it in a moment. I may observe that the right hon. Gentleman's remonstrances as to surprise being felt that the Government should bring in a Bill of this kind does not concern us, because they were remonstrances addressed to his own followers, and to his followers upon this side of the House. I think his remonstrances were unreasonable. It is an unreasonable thing for a Government, whose Chief has just denounced a people, as representing, by their majority, the most backward and least civilised portion of the community—it is rather an extraordinary thing that the same Government should bring forward a measure for performing the operation proposed in this Bill. It is an extraordinary thing too that Local Government should be taken as the legitimate crowning of an edifice, whose foundations are laid in coercion, and in exceptionally repressive legislation. The two orders of architecture are indeed widely different, the order of the foundation and the order of the column itself are widely different, and I do not see how they can be reconciled, the one with the other. This is not the time for those perplexing debates, and I have no desire to pursue them in the presence of a policy which could only be sound on the condition that all the things that have been stated from those Benches opposite for the last six years about

the condition of Ireland are unsound and untrue. The question that we have to ask ourselves in examining the proposals of the Government are of an entirely different kind. We have to ask ourselves, taking their own starting-point, whether the Bill is a Bill constructed on the lines of English and Scotch Local Government; we have to ask ourselves whether it fulfils the only object for which local representative bodies were created in England and Scotland, and the only object for which they can be desired in Ireland; we have to ask ourselves whether it does fulfil, or is likely to fulfil, the objects of local self-government, or whether it does confer local self-government substantially in any sense that makes it worth anything; or whether it is not likely to produce administrative confusion, and increase local disorganization in Ireland? I admit the reasonableness of the right hon. Gentleman's claim, that we should not pass judgment until we have seen the Bill in print. I accept that, and I do not propose to enter into any details except one or two remarks of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the measure that has been laid before the House. We have been able, thanks to the very lucid way in which the right hon. Gentleman laid down the lines of his proposal, to disentangle the main principle upon which the Bill has been constructed; and that is all, at this stage, that is necessary for the House to do, or that it usually does. We, on this occasion, have no intention of resisting formally the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman for bringing in this Bill. But let there be no mistake; this Bill is a less liberal Bill, it is a more reactionary Bill, than the Bill brought before the House in the year 1879 by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet. I have recollection of the provisions of it, and I believe gentlemen from Ireland, who remember it better, perhaps, than I do, will bear me out in saying that this Bill is a less liberal Bill than that of 1879. I will not go over the various provisions which the right hon. Gentleman laid before the House, except in the case of two matters upon which he relies, which I

think are worthy of the consideration of the House, and which I believe are the substance of the Bill. He relies, first, on the cumulative vote, which I think the most broken reed any minority trembling for its privileges could be made to rely upon. It is undoubtedly the opinion of those who favour minority representation that it is the most cumbrous and the least satisfactory, and that it will be found to be no protection at all. But the second point, as to the safeguards, is the real pith of the Bill. It is incredible that a Minister—considering every principle laid down by the spokesman of the Government at the beginning of this Parliament, that Local Government should be extended to Ireland equally with England and Scotland—should bring forward a proposal now, that the Judge of Assize, sitting, I presume, like an Election Judge, without a jury, should try these charges of malversation, or of corruption, or of oppression, and that if these charges are made, then the Judge should proceed to try the County Council.

An hon. MEMBER: Two Judges.

MR. MORLEY: One Judge or two, it makes no difference; we are to try the County Council in the dock, and are to declare if, in the opinion of a Judge, they are guilty or not guilty. He does not deny that the Judges are to decide upon the question of guilt; to decide upon the charge of malversation; on the question of corruption, on the question of oppression. But I would point out that, under the Act which throws upon Judges the duty of trying election cases, the corruption is expressly and carefully defined. But now, what is oppression? What is to be in the mind of the Judge when the County Council is put into the dock on a charge of oppression? Is it defined in the Bill? It is, I suppose, not defined in the Bill. Is the definition of oppression in the Bill, or does the definition of it only lie in the bosom of the Judge?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Why not?

MR. MORLEY: The right hon. Gentleman asks why not. Why, all the privileges and all the freedom of Englishmen depend upon Statute and not upon the definition of a Judge.

*Mr. John Morley*

Is the Judge to constitute a new crime? Oppression is surely a new crime. In the Coercion Act, of which the right hon. Gentleman is very proud, in that Act he created new crime; but in this Bill new crimes are to be created and pressed home, not to an individual, but to elected bodies of gentlemen. I think that is so monstrous a proposal that I am quite sincere in saying that I am disappointed in the Bill. We knew there would be artificial safeguards which we should have to protest against; that the friends of the right hon. Gentleman in Ulster would seek for them, but I think he might have found some safeguard which would not have affronted every principle of his Bill. The right hon. Gentleman says it is necessary to give this measure to Ireland because you have given a measure to England and Scotland. I should like to see the right hon. Gentleman consenting to introduce into a Bill, which would be supposed to satisfy the English and Scotch people, a proposal which would place the English and Scotch County Councils in the dock for a Judge of Assize to try them, and give his opinion of oppression. This proposal shows that he distrusts the Irish people, who are to be treated, as this Bill implies, as debased Helots, which we are responsible for having made them. All I can say is this, that I should like nothing better than that you should dissolve on this question; yes, as soon as you like. Go to the English counties and tell them you have brought in a Bill for Ireland, nominally a Bill to give equality and similarity of institutions between England and Ireland, which is to expose their elected County Councils to being tried by the Judges of the land, who are to say whether they are guilty or not. From that point of view I am not disappointed. If I had cared more for Party interests than I care for good government in Ireland, I should not have been disappointed; but I repeat it, the country, depend upon it, will see through this monstrous imposture. It will see that a measure brought in containing such a provision as that is a mockery of the House

of Commons, is a falsification of your pledges, and is a just ground for new and fresh irritation in Ireland.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford City) and Mr. JUSTIN MCCARTHY (Londonderry City) rose.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Redmond (Loud cries of "Mr. McCarthy.") Mr. Redmond rose first. (Cries of "No. Mr. McCarthy rose first.") I think Mr. Redmond did rise first, and I call upon him.

(6.5.) MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I did not see the hon. Member for Derry City rise in his place, and I assure the House that in taking the opportunity that thus early has been given to me of saying two or three words at once upon this Bill, I mean no personal disrespect to him, and I can assure the House also, that I will not stand between the House and, no doubt, the anxiety of hon. Members for a moment. The right hon. Gentleman who has just resumed his seat has stated to the House that he would not upon this occasion enter a formal vote against the Bill. For my part, I hope the earliest opportunity will be taken for enabling Members representing Irish constituencies of protesting by their votes against a sham and an insult, which they recognise in the Bill as it has been sketched by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. This Bill, I venture to assert, will not receive the sympathy or the support of any section of the people of Ireland. I do not believe that even those hon. Gentlemen representing Orange constituencies in this House, for whose feelings such elaborate precautions have been taken by the Government, will be able to declare themselves in favour of this Bill; while every man who represents any section of the Irish people who claim to be Nationalist will feel it their duty to offer to it a strenuous opposition. For myself, I may be permitted to say that I came into this House this evening with a perfectly open mind upon this subject. I had not a very high expectation as to what the Government would propose, but for my part I was prepared if they introduced a good Bill to give that Bill a hearty support through all its stages in this House. But they have intro-

duced a measure which makes it impossible, as I believe, for any Irishman with any self-respect whatever to give it anything except the most strenuous opposition. In itself I say the Bill is a sham—not only is the Bill in itself a sham, but in the manner also in which it was proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. The Bill is an insult to the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by reminding the House and the country that this was, forsooth, no new departure of the Tory Party to introduce Local Government in Ireland. He reminded the House that the policy of the Tory Party was a policy of coercion, if you like, but a policy of creating for Ireland similar institutions with England. They have passed for Ireland whole-hearted, thoroughgoing, perpetual Coercion Acts, and when they take up what professes to be the supplementary part of their policy they have produced a measure which is absolutely beneath contempt. I thought at one part of the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury that the Bill was introduced with a view to an early Dissolution; but before he sat down I changed my opinion, because I did not conceive that any body of Ministers could be guilty of the imbecility of going to the country with such a proposal as the Bill proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. What, in a sentence, are the provisions of this Bill? The Grand Juries—which as a system have been denounced by almost every party in the State; which undoubtedly are indefensible in principle—the Grand Juries are to remain in existence, for the discharge of those very duties which, above all others, they have fulfilled in the most unsatisfactory way to the Irish people. The objections which have been held to the working of the Grand Juries have not been confined to objections as to the building of a bridge or the management of a little road in the country. Our objections to the working of the Grand Juries have been in those very duties which are still to be left to them. They have exercised their duties partially, for they have been influenced by political and other improper motives in discharging those

duties, and those are the very duties which, under the provisions of this Bill, are left to them still to perform. They are to have the right of granting compensation for malicious injuries; they are to have the right of passing imperative presentments—as I am reminded, the most important part of the duties which at present remain with them. Not only that, but they are actually to exercise the practical right of veto upon every single penny to be expended in the shape of any capital expenditure in the county; because the House has grasped the fact that the County Councils are not to have the power of expending one single penny upon capital expenditure in Ireland without the consent of a Committee and that Committee is to be made up of seven Members nominated by the Grand Jury, and a casting vote to the Sheriff of the County; and though the right hon. Gentleman says his mind is open as to who should discharge the duty given to the Sheriff, still the fact remains that it is his intention to put over the County Councils to expend money for this purpose a Committee, the majority of whom will be nominated by the Grand Jury, which we say should be totally abolished. Then there are the limitations put upon the Councils. In every Council there are to be seven *ex officio* members whose franchise is to be limited, and limited in a way which, as an Irishman, I felt humiliated on being proposed in this House. Some hon. Members might imagine because of this controversy that has been going on in Ireland, and from statements made from platforms in Ireland, that some of the hon. members who share the views I hold upon Irish political questions would be in favour of legislation directed against the illiterate voters in that country. For my part, I utterly disclaim anything of the sort. I look forward to the near approach of the day when the illiterate voters will be removed, but by the march of education among the poorer classes; and I say that where there is no provision dealing with the illiterate voters in the measure of Local Government which Parliament has given to England, it is an insult to put it in a measure which you propose to give us in Ireland, which

*Mr. John Redmond*

is needed there no more than it is needed here. To the fact that the Bill is still to retain the traverse, I have no objection; if it stood alone few men would be inclined to quarrel with it. Then the Bill contains one of the most extraordinary proposals that I ever heard made to this House, namely, a proposal for investigation—a couple of Judges would have the right of dissolving these Councils. The right hon. Gentleman, in making his speech, said he took the scheme of the minority voting in the School Boards in England, but when he saw that, on its merits, he could not defend that scheme, he, forsooth, said, "It is better to take a scheme which you know to be stupid, but which is in existence, than to take a scheme which you know is good and wise, but which has not been put on trial." But when he comes to deal with the most essential portion of his proposals, namely, the one by which he proposes to dissolve the County Councils, does he propose a scheme for dissolving County Councils which has been tried in this country, or in any country on the face of the earth? Nothing of the kind. He proposes a brand new scheme, that, forsooth, a couple of Judges should take to themselves the right of dissolving these County Councils, and thus deprive the people of their right of franchise. I did not rise for the purpose of going into the details of this Bill. I only rose for the purpose of expressing at once, without a moment's delay, what my feeling is with reference to the proposals in the measure; and my feeling is, that these proposals are a mockery to the Irish people, and, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle said, a violation of the pledges of the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, when they pledged themselves that while they were giving coercion to Ireland on the one hand, they were giving to Ireland similar free institutions with England, and that, in addition to these proposals, constitute an insult to the Irish people, which, for my part, I shall do my best at every stage of this Bill to resent by my voice and my vote.

\*(6.15.) MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (Londonderry City): I do not think

that I ever heard in this House a Bill introduced under the same conditions, or a Motion made for the Second Reading of a Bill with the same results, as the Bill just introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury was one prolonged apology for introducing the measure at all. He evidently came "to bury Cæsar, not to praise him." Not one single word of genuine praise came from the right hon. Gentleman about the measure he was introducing. At one time he apologised to his own followers; at another time he turned to us and made an apology to us. To his own followers he said—"It may be a very strong measure; you may think it very daring on our part; but you see we must do something with these people over the way." And then he turned to us and said—"I admit that this is a very ridiculous measure, but one has to do something, and it is better to have a stupid thing that has been done before, than a wise thing that has never been done before." Exactly. But you have now introduced a stupid thing that was never tried before, and I venture to say that never will be tried in this case or in any other. This, then, is the measure which is to win and wean the Irish people from all their wild desire for Home Rule. This is the measure which was promised to us long ago by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. I wonder what he thinks of it. This is the sort of measure which was to make us settle down composedly for ever more under the Tory and Coercionist Government, and return thanks to the powers above who gave us such beneficent masters. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle well said that this Bill is a monstrous imposture. It is also a very miserable and pitiable farce. I was disposed towards compassion for the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury when labouring with these absurdities which are called clauses in the Bill; the checks and balances, and the ingenious artifices—or rather, I should say, not ingenious, but very clumsy artifices—



which seemed to be giving things with one hand while taking them away with the other. But one can understand the position of the right hon. Gentleman. He was like the captain of a vessel who at the one time has to fight an enemy and to try to keep down a mutiny below the hatches. I could not make anything of this Bill under conditions such as these. I do not propose to go into the details of this Bill. It seems to be all details. I can get no gleam or spark of meaning anywhere, except that it is a Bill based on the principle of "Oh, my prophetic soul, my uncle!"—the principle that the Irish people are like the Hottentots. We are to be regarded as below any other nation that pretends to be civilised in our right to civilisation. As regards one clause, the right hon. Gentleman asked us indignantly, with a sort of sneer in his voice, "If the thing is good enough for Scotland, is it not good enough for you?" But that particular clause was forced by the Tories upon the Scotch Members, and I say that what was merely forced on the reluctant Scotch Members is not good enough for Irish Members. I do not propose to follow the arguments that have been presented to the House by the right hon. Gentleman in support of the Bill; but I consider provisions have been introduced into this Bill which were unknown to any Statute whatever in this country before. It has been worked on the principle of coercion, and begins by putting a brand on the Irish people, so that even a measure of local self-government for them must be fortified round by new clauses, new schemes, new crimes invented for the purpose, and new means of punishment. I do not care whether the right hon. Gentleman's Bill is allowed to go through its first reading or not. I care little whether it is opposed in the beginning, or whether it is opposed in the end. My own feeling is that we ought to have nothing whatever to do with it; that we ought to express that feeling in the beginning, and reject the unclean thing. If I might venture to give the right hon. Gentleman one piece of advice, the piece of advice which I, for

one, should like to give him, would be this—"Take your Bill, and put it in the fire."

(6.20.) Mr. W. G. ELLISON MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I do not imagine that there will be in the minds of the cesspayers of Ireland any deep reflection of the very deep indignation exhibited on the Benches opposite, because I conceive that when the cesspayers of Ireland examine the provisions of this Bill, they will see what in reality the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do by the Bill. The Bill proposes to give a non-elected and non-elective body a complete and absolute control over the fiscal arrangements of the country. ("No!") Yes; that is what the cesspayers of Ireland have long desired to obtain, and they do not look on the establishment of County Councils as the perpetration of any deep political design. All they wish to have is the management of the county affairs in their own hands, and I believe, so far as I could gather from the clear and explicit statement of the First Lord of the Treasury, the Bill—which I believe to be a broad and generous Bill—will completely fulfil the expectations of the majority of the body of cesspayers of Ireland, whether great or small. I do not believe that there exists in any body of cesspayers in Ireland any great prospect or belief in seeing their affairs handed over to County Councils which would have unrestrained and unlimited powers of dealing with the finances of the county; and, therefore, I think that the provisions which the right hon. Gentleman has indicated and placed in the Bill to prevent extravagant and illegitimate expenditure on the part of the County Councils will be as heartily received by the small cesspayers as by the larger cesspayers in Ireland. I should like to reserve to myself full liberty upon one or two of the clauses connected especially with the franchise, and I think, the areas from which the Baronial and County Councils are to be selected; but, generally speaking, I desire—and I think I am expressing the opinion of all my hon. Friends who sit on this side of the House—to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman most heartily upon the measure which he has so successfully introduced.

*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*

6.25.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Donegal, S.): I confess I speak on this occasion with some difficulty. I have not made any secret outside—and see no reason why I should make any secret inside—this House that the constituency that I represent is not unanimously in favour of any scheme

of local self-government. At all events, I have gone to my constituents, and in every part of the constituency have told them what my views were. Now, I have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night, and have not the slightest desire to go into the details of the measure which he has outlined. But there are one or two points upon which I should like to express my opinion at once. First

all, as regards the duties that are to be imposed upon these Councils, I do not think that any fair objection can be taken to the scheme. The duties of the new Councils will be practically the same in character as the duties of the English and Scotch Councils. The fiscal functions of the Grand Jury as distinguished from their judicial or quasi-judicial functions will be vested in these elected bodies. Now that is all the Government promised to do, and I do not think that the country will be deceived by the boisterous merriment of the Front Opposition Bench and of hon. Members below the Gangway when they come to examine in cold print the actual facts of the case. The next thing I should like to deal with are the proposed checks and safeguards outlined by the right hon. Gentleman. One would think, to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, that they had never been a party to a Bill introduced by a Member of this House, that proposed checks and safeguards on an Irish Bill. I want to know what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian did when he was setting up a Governing Body in Ireland—or proposed to set up. Why, it is a matter of fact that he hedged that Bill round with safeguards of every description, and actually created two Orders in the Legislative Body he proposes to set up. I now come to the question of the franchise. Nobody can deny that here, again, the country will see to-morrow that the basis of the franchise is solid

and sound. The basis of the franchise is that every cesspayer shall have a vote. Nothing could be wider, nothing more democratic, than that. But the right hon. Gentleman by his Bill is guilty, says the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford, of one great sin—he has disfranchised the illiterate voter. I deny, taking the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, that he has done anything of the kind. What the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do, as I understand, is not to disfranchise anybody, but to withdraw the privilege that the law confers upon ignorance in this country. It is very easy in this country to laugh about the illiterate voter. They are not a considerable factor in either English or Scotch elections; but when they come up to a fourth of a total constituency, or more than a fourth, they then become a factor; and I say it is not any hardship to compel the illiterate voter to do the same as any other voter—that he must know what he is to do. And in view of recent elections in Ireland, and in view of the fact that priests were to be found as personating agents in the polling booths superintending the voting of these illiterates, I say the right hon. Gentleman has acted wisely in putting that clause into his Bill, and I hope he will stick to it. I now come to the question of the cumulative vote as distinguished from the franchise itself, and I confess candidly that I have some little doubts about that. I have some doubts about the minority vote at all, and I tell the House candidly why I have doubts. It will very probably be useful, but if the right hon. Gentleman's intention is to protect or to help Protestant minorities to representation in the South and West of Ireland, in almost every case in that part of the country these minorities are so slender that I hardly think any plan of cumulative voting will secure them representation. I admit that it will work better in the North, and I think it will do good in the North, because there the Catholic minorities are substantial, and I believe by this plan they will get representation, which I hold to be a good thing, on these Boards in the North. There are counties in Ireland where they would probably have no

representation but for this; and, whilst I do not think this will be of much aid to Protestant minorities in the South and West, I believe it will be a great help to substantial Catholic minorities in the North, and I believe that it is worthy of consideration on that account alone. But I am convinced of this, that of all plans of minority voting this is the least harmful and the easiest understood. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) waxed very eloquent about the County Council being hedged in with regard to capital expenditure. What was the promise of the hon. and learned Member for Longford (Mr. T. Healy) last year? I remember his promise perfectly.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I stick to it.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: His promise across the floor of the House was:—"If you introduce a Bill founded on the lines of the English or the Scottish Bills then I will support it." But this clause about capital expenditure which the hon. and learned Member for Waterford derides is absolutely founded on the Scottish precedent, and, I take it, is almost word for word. The hon. and learned Member's promise was not to support a Bill which would receive the support of the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries (Mr. R. T. Reid), but such a Bill as was embodied in the Scottish Act.

MR. T. M. HEALY: No, no.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I remember the promise given distinctly across the floor of the House. I do not pretend to fix him to every word or idea in the Bill; but when a clause such as this, to control the expenditure, comes up to be discussed, and you find it in the Scottish Act, I say hon. Members below the Gangway are barred by the promise of the hon. and learned Member for Longford from at least deriding it. I now come to the last part of the Bill that I care to discuss on the Motion for its First Reading, and I admit at once that I think the Government will find themselves in the greatest difficulty in regard to it—namely, the provisions with regard to suppressing County Councils where it might be deemed necessary to suppress them. But,

Mr. T. W. Russell

I think, the House at all events, instead of going off into merriment or exploding in passion at such a proposal as that, ought to look the facts in the face as they exist in Ireland. What have we been told? We have been told by hon. Members below the Gangway that every one of these bodies will be captured—that is the phrase—captured and worked for political purposes. I am not saying that they will not; I am not saying that they ought not to be. At all events, there is fair warning given authoritatively by the hon. Member for North East Cork (Mr. W. O'Brien), that everyone of these bodies, that every public and popular institution of the country would be captured for ulterior purposes. I start with that, and I say the House is bound to take cognizance of a threat of that kind. Will the House take the analogy of the Board of Guardians? They are also public and popular institutions.

An hon. MEMBER: Partly.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Well, they are the only popularly elected body in the country.

MR. W. O'BRIEN: What about the *ex officios*?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I am aware of the *ex officios*, but I say the Board of Guardians are the only analogous Boards that you can consider, because they are the only Boards of the kind in the country. I want to ask, and especially do I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow (Sir G. Trevelyan), how many Boards did he suppress? These Gentlemen go off in merriment and in explosions of indignation at the idea of suppressing a public body, when they themselves have suppressed them times without number and said nothing about it. (Unionist Cheers and Laughter.) Did the right hon. Gentleman believe that they ought to be suppressed? He must have done so, or he would not have suppressed them, and if he believes that public Boards in Ireland were capable of doing things for which he judges suppression a necessary punishment, I say that the Government is bound in this Bill to act in the same way. I do not object to the power of suppression. I object to the method. I think that is cumbrous. I think it is.

very faulty, and I do not think I shall be able to support it, and I tell the Government that candidly. But as to the necessity for some power of appeal in cases of malversation I have not the slightest doubt that that is necessary, and I hope, whilst that clause will not be passed, that some power will be retained which will be capable of pulling those Boards up when occasion arises. The past history of the country shows that occasion has arisen, and if it has arisen in the past we have no right to act on the supposition that it will not arise in the future. I do not know that I ought to say more save in regard to one subject. I think the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) showed his hand just a little too plainly during the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. He interrupted the right hon. Gentleman to know what he proposed to do in regard to imperative presentments. I say that is just showing his hand a little too soon.

MR. SEXTON: What is my hand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I say these are subjects of which we have had some experience already. They involve presentments for extra police, and we know what happened in the city of Limerick.

MR. SEXTON: No, no! They do not.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: They involve, I maintain, the presentments for extra police. These are imperative presentments. I say we have had some experience in the past with the Limerick Corporation in that matter, and I think the Government have acted rightly in simply transferring the fiscal functions of the Grand Jury and retaining in their hands their judicial and quasi-judicial functions.

MR. SEXTON: May I be allowed to say, with reference to the hon. Gentleman's remarks that I showed my hand, that I merely asked for information that the right hon. Gentleman omitted to give, and there is no reason why the County Councils more than the Grand Jury should have these presentments, seeing that the Judge of assize can make an order.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: At all events, I am exceedingly glad that that

power has not been transferred to the County Councils. It is partly a judicial function, and I hope it will be retained by the Grand Jury. It is much too soon to discuss the clauses of this Bill in detail, and all I can say now is that I am prepared to vote for the First Reading of this Bill if there be a division; and whilst I reserve to myself full liberty on the clauses of the Bill, I believe there is in the measure the foundation for a good system of Local Government for Ireland.

(7.40.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I think the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone suffered somewhat from the fact that he was not able to have it written out beforehand, and that if he had seen the Bill yesterday, or even this morning, he would have made rather a better hand of it. The hon. Member challenges me with regard to an expression which I used last year with reference to the system of Local Government. Everything I said last year I fully and fairly stand by. The whole bent of my mind—my whole practice and desire in this House for 12 years—has been, whenever I saw a Bill introduced of which any good whatever could be made, if I could possibly do so without sacrifice of principle, to try and make the best I possibly could of that measure. But as to this Bill, a more contemptible Bill, a Bill more impossible for us to accept, without loss of self-respect, I have never known to be introduced. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) mentioned the Scotch Act, and said that one of the provisions which was taken exception to, that which is called, I think, the Joint Committee Provision, is to be found in the Scotch Act. Very good; but are not the rates in Scotland divided? The landlord in Scotland pays half the county rates, and that being so, it is very legitimate that the landlord should have representation. But is that so with us? The hon. Member for South Tyrone is a Scotchman, and tries to palm this off on the ignorance of the House, when he knows very well that in Scotland the occupier only pays half the county rate, and in Ireland he pays the whole of it, and that, therefore, while in point of form, no doubt, it may

seem a matter of equality to embody the same system in regard to both countries, in practice and in fact there is a gross inequality and the grossest injustice. I go through this Bill from start to finish, and from the crown of its head to the sole of its foot, and I find no goodness or soundness in it. My only regret is this, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Morley) stated that his Party would not divide against it on the First Reading. For my part I can only say that I shall be delighted if the Opposition, whether it be Liberal or Nationalist, divides against this Bill. I was glad, indeed, to hear the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford (Mr. J. E. Redmond). I am glad he took the line he did; but, at the same time, without laying the blame upon any Party, I mournfully reflect that the true inwardness of the Government was shown by the Solicitor General for England (Sir E. Clarke) in a speech to his constituents a few months ago, when he pointed out that there was now a division in the Irish ranks, and when he declared that he believed that the Bill of the Government would be an easy Bill to pass, because, said he, "A large section of the Irish Members will be in favour of it." I believe that the Government thought they had Ireland at their feet, and that owing to the dissension which prevails in our country, anything could be forced down our throats. But I think the First Lord of the Treasury and his Party will find before very much later that this Bill will be rather a tougher job for him to pass into law than even a Coercion Act. I can well understand the Government insisting that a particular clause must be passed in the interest of law and order when it was a Coercion Bill they had to deal with, on the plea that society was crumbling to its foundation, and that it was necessary to appoint two Removables to deal with the matter—that there was some Parliamentary necessity for proceeding to the Closure. But when you have a Bill running into all the crevices and interstices of county life in Ireland, extending to at least 100 clauses, dealing with the question of the powers of the old Grand Juries as regards malicious injuries, as

well as the powers of the new body which you now propose to constitute, I can only say that I believe this Bill is dead and buried almost before it is born. Of course, there is one thing to be said. The Government may be serious in passing the Bill; but if they are, I, who have always respected the intellect of the First Lord of the Treasury, can only say that he has fallen very much in my estimation. I cannot conceive that any man of the astuteness of the First Lord of the Treasury—except he believed he would capture some wing of the Irish Party—would expect that this Bill had the smallest chance of passing into law. If he has no hope, what is the good of this Bill? As a dissolving Bill it is absolutely worthless to Her Majesty's Government. You cannot recommend it to English constituencies; you cannot recommend it to the Scottish. The Irish constituencies would not have it. I think the shadow of the Birmingham Congress—where the previous question was moved—will so prevail in the Tory Party that they will give the Bill very cold support on their platforms when the Dissolution is sprung upon them. Therefore, I say, from either point of view, whether as a stalking horse for the Dissolution, or as an effective measure which can be passed through this House, the Bill is an absolute failure, and has died upon the lips of its author. Therefore, for us to make any criticism as to its provisions at this stage would be an absolute mistake. English Members, who know nothing whatever about the matter, will no doubt talk eloquently with respect to the Grand Jury proposal. Now, let me inform hon. Gentlemen on the Tory Benches that there is no subject more difficult to understand than the subject of the Irish Grand Jury law, and when the Member for South Tyrone talked about "imperative presentments," I venture to think he did not know what they were. A great grievance is the grievance as to "malicious injuries." The right hon. Gentleman, with half the astuteness he sometimes displays, gave us the instance that the Grand Jury would still be allowed to retain the power of malicious injury in cases of maiming and murdering. Will the House believe

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

that until four years ago it was not even discovered that the Grand Jurors, except under the Coercion Acts, had that power, and they now only have that power in the case of any policeman injured in a riot, and in the case of a witness who may have given evidence for the Crown; so that the power as regards maiming and murdering is non-existent except in the most special cases. And, furthermore, in the very place where that power is needed more than anywhere else, the City of Belfast, where the Catholics were mowed down in 1886, and where policemen were shot and killed, that power does not exist at all. The widow of a constable, a most respectable woman with a helpless family, because that power does not exist, was left penniless until a grant was given from Her Majesty's Government. What is the power of the Grand Jury as regards malicious injury? They have this power, and a more mischievous power was never placed in the hands of irresponsible men, who do not pay one penny from their pockets. A haystack is burned. It is always the haystack of a land grabber. It is forgotten that the very fact that if the man came before a landlords' body and said that he was a land grabber, that is the very thing to get compensation at twice the ordinary rate of pay. There was the case of Mrs. Lucas—tried at Cork Assizes four years ago. She was the wife of a Grand Juror, the wife of a Magistrate of the County of Cork, and she was tried for arson—for pouring paraffin on the curtains, with her own babes in a cradle in the upper room. She got compensation from the Grand Jury for malicious injuries, on the ground that she was boycotted, and her husband himself was one of the Grand Jury. If there ever was a provision which worked injustice it is this provision with regard to malicious injury. When we wish for county reform in Ireland, and when we desire Grand Jury reform, which would get rid of this odious malicious injury system, which has worked so much injustice in the past, I would not give sixpence for a Bill which did not deal with this question. I shall be told by some gentlemen opposite that this presentment can be

traversed. Yes, it can be traversed before a Judge of Assize, one of the gentlemen who are to have the power of destroying these new County Boards. It may be traversed by cumbrous machinery. All the Judges, with two exceptions, I think, refused common juries in these cases. Who are the best judges, from the landlords' point of view, whether this Bill is a good one or not? The Irish landlords. And the Irish landlords assume, as a matter of course, by resolution of their Committee, that the Government would deal with this question of malicious injuries. Did the Landlords' Committee, or at any rate as many of the landlords who have intelligence, propose to deal with the subject? Did they imagine it would be left to the Grand Jury to continue to have this power? Then the Irish landlords are more extreme than the First Lord of the Treasury. They passed a resolution taking away from the Grand Jurors the power of malicious injuries, and they proposed to place it on the County Court Judge. So that, in the confession of the landlords themselves, the Government are taking a retrograde, and even a reactionary step. The other day the Member for South Tyrone had 300 bogus voters in his constituency. They were all allowed to go on, because the revising barrister refused to grant the objections, and the revising barrister got 100 guineas for doing that duty for the Member for South Tyrone. The Member for South Tyrone got him made a County Court Judge with £1,200 a year. For my own part, bad as the proposal of Her Majesty's Government is, I should regard the proposal of the Irish Landlords' Committee as far better than that which is in this Bill. It may be that the Government have made this Bill so bad as it is for the purpose of having Amendments made to it in Committee. They propose something awfully bad—so bad, that anything will be an improvement on it. Then when you propose something decent the Government will say, "Let us split the difference," and they give us something betwixt and between. That may be the idea working in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman. If it is, I will

which seemed to be giving things with one hand while taking them away with the other. But one can understand the position of the right hon. Gentleman. He was like the captain of a vessel who at the one time has to fight an enemy and to try to keep down a mutiny below the hatches. I could not make anything of this Bill under conditions such as these. I do not propose to go into the details of this Bill. It seems to be all details. I can get no gleam or spark of meaning anywhere, except that it is a Bill based on the principle of "Oh, my prophetic soul, my uncle!"—the principle that the Irish people are like the Hottentots. We are to be regarded as below any other nation that pretends to be civilised in our right to civilisation. As regards one clause, the right hon. Gentleman asked us indignantly, with a sort of sneer in his voice, "If the thing is good enough for Scotland, is it not good enough for you?" But that particular clause was forced by the Tories upon the Scotch Members, and I say that what was merely forced on the reluctant Scotch Members is not good enough for Irish Members. I do not propose to follow the arguments that have been presented to the House by the right hon. Gentleman in support of the Bill; but I consider provisions have been introduced into this Bill which were unknown to any Statute whatever in this country before. It has been worked on the principle of coercion, and begins by putting a brand on the Irish people, so that even a measure of local self-government for them must be fortified round by new clauses, new schemes, new crimes invented for the purpose, and new means of punishment. I do not care whether the right hon. Gentleman's Bill is allowed to go through its first reading or not. I care little whether it is opposed in the beginning, or whether it is opposed in the end. My own feeling is that we ought to have nothing whatever to do with it; that we ought to express that feeling in the beginning, and reject the unclean thing. If I might venture to give the right hon. Gentleman one piece of advice, the piece of advice which I, for

one, should like to give him, would be this—"Take your Bill, and put it in the fire."

(6.20.) MR. W. G. ELLISON  
MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I do not imagine that there will be in the minds of the cesspayers of Ireland any deep reflection of the very deep indignation exhibited on the Benches opposite, because I conceive that when the cesspayers of Ireland examine the provisions of this Bill, they will see what in reality the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do by the Bill. The Bill proposes to give a non-elected and non-elective body a complete and absolute control over the fiscal arrangements of the country. ("No!") Yes; that is what the cesspayers of Ireland have long desired to obtain, and they do not look on the establishment of County Councils as the perpetration of any deep political design. All they wish to have is the management of the county affairs in their own hands, and I believe, so far as I could gather from the clear and explicit statement of the First Lord of the Treasury, the Bill—which I believe to be a broad and generous Bill—will completely fulfil the expectations of the majority of the body of cesspayers of Ireland, whether great or small. I do not believe that there exists in any body of cesspayers in Ireland any great prospect or belief in seeing their affairs handed over to County Councils which would have unrestrained and unlimited powers of dealing with the finances of the county; and, therefore, I think that the provisions which the right hon. Gentleman has indicated and placed in the Bill to prevent extravagant and illegitimate expenditure on the part of the County Councils will be as heartily received by the small cesspayers as by the larger cesspayers in Ireland. I should like to reserve to myself full liberty upon one or two of the clauses connected especially with the franchise, and I think, the areas from which the Baronial and County Councils are to be selected; but, generally speaking, I desire—and I think I am expressing the opinion of all my hon. Friends who sit on this side of the House—to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman most heartily upon the measure which he has so successfully introduced.

*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*

\*(6.25.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I confess I speak on this occasion with some difficulty. I have not made any secret outside—and I see no reason why I should make any secret inside—this House that the constituency that I represent is not unanimously in favour of any scheme of local self-government. At all events, I have gone to my constituents, and in every part of the constituency I have told them what my views were. Now, I have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night, and I have not the slightest desire to go into the details of the measure which he has outlined. But there are one or two points upon which I should like to express my opinion at once. First of all, as regards the duties that are to be imposed upon these Councils, I do not think that any fair objection can be taken to the scheme. The duties of the new Councils will be practically the same in character as the duties of the English and Scotch Councils. The fiscal function of the Grand Jury as distinguished from their judicial or quasi-judicial functions will be vested in these elected bodies. Now that is all the Government promised to do, and I do not think that the country will be deceived by the boisterous merriment of the Front Opposition Bench and of hon. Members below the Gangway when they come to examine in cold print the actual facts of the case. The next thing I should like to deal with are the proposed checks and safeguards outlined by the right hon. Gentleman. One would think, to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, that they had never been a party to a Bill introduced by a Member of this House, that proposed checks and safeguards on an Irish Bill. I want to know what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian did when he was setting up a Governing Body in Ireland—or proposed to set up. Why, it is a matter of fact that he hedged that Bill round with safeguards of every description, and actually created two Orders in the Legislative Body he proposes to set up. I now come to the question of the franchise. Nobody can deny that here, again, the country will see to-morrow that the basis of the franchise is solid

and sound. The basis of the franchise is that every cesspayer shall have a vote. Nothing could be wider, nothing more democratic, than that. But the right hon. Gentleman by his Bill is guilty, says the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford, of one great sin—he has disfranchised the illiterate voter. I deny, taking the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, that he has done anything of the kind. What the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do, as I understand, is not to disfranchise anybody, but to withdraw the privilege that the law confers upon ignorance in this country. It is very easy in this country to laugh about the illiterate voter. They are not a considerable factor in either English or Scotch elections; but when they come up to a fourth of a total constituency, or more than a fourth, they then become a factor; and I say it is not any hardship to compel the illiterate voter to do the same as any other voter—that he must know what he is to do. And in view of recent elections in Ireland, and in view of the fact that priests were to be found as personating agents in the polling booths superintending the voting of these illiterates, I say the right hon. Gentleman has acted wisely in putting that clause into his Bill, and I hope he will stick to it. I now come to the question of the cumulative vote as distinguished from the franchise itself, and I confess candidly that I have some little doubts about that. I have some doubts about the minority vote at all, and I tell the House candidly why I have doubts. It will very probably be useful, but if the right hon. Gentleman's intention is to protect or to help Protestant minorities to representation in the South and West of Ireland, in almost every case in that part of the country these minorities are so slender that I hardly think any plan of cumulative voting will secure them representation. I admit that it will work better in the North, and I think it will do good in the North, because there the Catholic minorities are substantial, and I believe by this plan they will get representation, which I hold to be a good thing, on these Boards in the North. There are counties in Ireland where they would probably have no



representation but for this; and, whilst I do not think this will be of much aid to Protestant minorities in the South and West, I believe it will be a great help to substantial Catholic minorities in the North, and I believe that it is worthy of consideration on that account alone. But I am convinced of this, that of all plans of minority voting this is the least harmful and the easiest understood. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) waxed very eloquent about the County Council being hedged in with regard to capital expenditure. What was the promise of the hon. and learned Member for Longford (Mr. T. Healy) last year? I remember his promise perfectly.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I stick to it.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: His promise across the floor of the House was:—"If you introduce a Bill founded on the lines of the English or the Scottish Bills then I will support it." But this clause about capital expenditure which the hon. and learned Member for Waterford derides is absolutely founded on the Scottish precedent, and, I take it, is almost word for word. The hon. and learned Member's promise was not to support a Bill which would receive the support of the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries (Mr. R. T. Reid), but such a Bill as was embodied in the Scottish Act.

MR. T. M. HEALY: No, no.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I remember the promise given distinctly across the floor of the House. I do not pretend to fix him to every word or idea in the Bill; but when a clause such as this, to control the expenditure, comes up to be discussed, and you find it in the Scottish Act, I say hon. Members below the Gangway are barred by the promise of the hon. and learned Member for Longford from at least deriding it. I now come to the last part of the Bill that I care to discuss on the Motion for its First Reading, and I admit at once that I think the Government will find themselves in the greatest difficulty in regard to it—namely, the provisions with regard to suppressing County Councils where it might be

d

1 all

I think, the House at all events, instead of going off into merriment or exploding in passion at such a proposal as that, ought to look the facts in the face as they exist in Ireland. What have we been told? We have been told by hon. Members below the Gangway that every one of these bodies will be captured—that is the phrase—captured and worked for political purposes. I am not saying that they will not; I am not saying that they ought not to be. At all events, there is fair warning given authoritatively by the hon. Member for North East Cork (Mr. W. O'Brien), that everyone of these bodies, that every public and popular institution of the country would be captured for ulterior purposes. I start with that, and I say the House is bound to take cognizance of a threat of that kind. Will the House take the analogy of the Board of Guardians? They are also public and popular institutions.

An hon. MEMBER: Partly.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Well, they are the only popularly elected body in the country.

MR. W. O'BRIEN: What about the *ex officios*?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I am aware of the *ex officios*, but I say the Board of Guardians are the only analogous Boards that you can consider, because they are the only Boards of the kind in the country. I want to ask, and especially do I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow (Sir G. Trevelyan), how many Boards did he suppress? These Gentlemen go off in merriment and in explosions of indignation at the idea of suppressing a public body, when they themselves have suppressed them times without number and said nothing about it. (Unionist Cheers and Laughter.) Did the right hon. Gentleman believe that they ought to be suppressed? He must have done so, or he would not have suppressed them, and if he believes that public Boards in Ireland were capable of doing things for which he judges suppression a necessary punishment, I say that the Government is bound in this Bill to act in the same way. I do not object to the power of suppression. I object to the method. I think that is cumbrous. I think it is.

very faulty, and I do not think I shall be able to support it, and I tell the Government that candidly. But as to the necessity for some power of appeal in cases of malversation I have not the slightest doubt that that is necessary, and I hope, whilst that clause will not be passed, that some power will be retained which will be capable of pulling those Boards up when occasion arises. The past history of the country shows that occasion has arisen, and if it has arisen in the past we have no right to act on the supposition that it will not arise in the future. I do not know that I ought to say more in regard to one subject. I think the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) showed his hand just a little too plainly during the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. He interrupted the right hon. Gentleman to know what he proposed to do in regard to imperative presentments. I say that is just showing his hand a little too soon.

MR. SEXTON: What is my hand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I say these are subjects of which we have had some experience already. They involve presentments for extra police, and we know what happened in the city of Limerick.

MR. SEXTON: No, no! They do not.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: They involve, I maintain, the presentments for extra police. These are imperative presentments. I say we have had some experience in the past with the Limerick Corporation in that matter, and I think the Government have acted rightly in simply transferring the fiscal functions of the Grand Jury and retaining in their hands their judicial and quasi-judicial functions.

MR. SEXTON: May I be allowed to say, with reference to the hon. Gentleman's remarks that I showed my hand, that I merely asked for information that the right hon. Gentleman omitted to give, and there is no reason why the County Councils more than the Grand Jury should have these presentments, seeing that the Judge of Assize can make an order.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: At all events, I am exceedingly glad that that

power has not been transferred to the County Councils. It is partly a judicial function, and I hope it will be retained by the Grand Jury. It is much too soon to discuss the clauses of this Bill in detail, and all I can say now is that I am prepared to vote for the First Reading of this Bill if there be a division; and whilst I reserve to myself full liberty on the clauses of the Bill, I believe there is in the measure the foundation for a good system of Local Government for Ireland.

(7.40.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I think the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone suffered somewhat from the fact that he was not able to have it written out beforehand, and that if he had seen the Bill yesterday, or even this morning, he would have made rather a better hand of it. The hon. Member challenges me with regard to an expression which I used last year with reference to the system of Local Government. Everything I said last year I fully and fairly stand by. The whole bent of my mind—my whole practice and desire in this House for 12 years—has been, whenever I saw a Bill introduced of which any good whatever could be made, if I could possibly do so without sacrifice of principle, to try and make the best I possibly could of that measure. But as to this Bill, a more contemptible Bill, a Bill more impossible for us to accept, without loss of self-respect, I have never known to be introduced. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) mentioned the Scotch Act, and said that one of the provisions which was taken exception to, that which is called, I think, the Joint Committee Provision, is to be found in the Scotch Act. Very good; but are not the rates in Scotland divided? The landlord in Scotland pays half the county rates, and that being so, it is very legitimate that the landlord should have representation. But is that so with us? The hon. Member for South Tyrone is a Scotchman, and tries to palm this off on the ignorance of the House, when he knows very well that in Scotland the occupier only pays half the county rate, and in Ireland he pays the whole of it, and that, therefore, while in point of form, no doubt, it may

seem a matter of equality to embody the same system in regard to both countries, in practice and in fact there is a gross inequality and the grossest injustice. I go through this Bill from start to finish, and from the crown of its head to the sole of its foot, and I find no goodness or soundness in it. My only regret is this, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Morley) stated that his Party would not divide against it on the First Reading. For my part I can only say that I shall be delighted if the Opposition, whether it be Liberal or Nationalist, divides against this Bill. I was glad, indeed, to hear the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford (Mr. J. E. Redmond). I am glad he took the line he did; but, at the same time, without laying the blame upon any Party, I mournfully reflect that the true inwardness of the Government was shown by the Solicitor General for England (Sir E. Clarke) in a speech to his constituents a few months ago, when he pointed out that there was now a division in the Irish ranks, and when he declared that he believed that the Bill of the Government would be an easy Bill to pass, because, said he, "A large section of the Irish Members will be in favour of it." I believe that the Government thought they had Ireland at their feet, and that owing to the dissension which prevails in our country, anything could be forced down our throats. But I think the First Lord of the Treasury and his Party will find before very much later that this Bill will be rather a tougher job for him to pass into law than even a Coercion Act. I can well understand the Government insisting that a particular clause must be passed in the interest of law and order when it was a Coercion Bill they had to deal with, on the plea that society was crumbling to its foundation, and that it was necessary to appoint two Removables to deal with the matter—that there was some Parliamentary necessity for proceeding to the Closure. But when you have a Bill running into all the crevices and interstices of county life in Ireland, extending to at least 100 clauses, dealing with the question of the powers of the old Grand Juries as regards malicious injuries, as

well as the powers of the new body which you now propose to constitute, I can only say that I believe this Bill is dead and buried almost before it is born. Of course, there is one thing to be said. The Government may be serious in passing the Bill; but if they are, I, who have always respected the intellect of the First Lord of the Treasury, can only say that he has fallen very much in my estimation. I cannot conceive that any man of the astuteness of the First Lord of the Treasury—except he believed he would capture some wing of the Irish Party—would expect that this Bill had the smallest chance of passing into law. If he has no hope, what is the good of this Bill? As a dissolving Bill it is absolutely worthless to Her Majesty's Government. You cannot recommend it to English constituencies; you cannot recommend it to the Scottish. The Irish constituencies would not have it. I think the shadow of the Birmingham Congress—where the previous question was moved—will so prevail in the Tory Party that they will give the Bill very cold support on their platforms when the Dissolution is sprung upon them. Therefore, I say, from either point of view, whether as a stalking horse for the Dissolution, or as an effective measure which can be passed through this House, the Bill is an absolute failure, and has died upon the lips of its author. Therefore, for us to make any criticism as to its provisions at this stage would be an absolute mistake. English Members, who know nothing whatever about the matter, will no doubt talk eloquently with respect to the Grand Jury proposal. Now, let me inform hon. Gentlemen on the Tory Benches that there is no subject more difficult to understand than the subject of the Irish Grand Jury law, and when the Member for South Tyrone talked about "imperative pre-sentments," I venture to think he did not know what they were. A great grievance is the grievance as to "malicious injuries." The right hon. Gentleman, with half the astuteness he sometimes displays, gave us the instance that the Grand Jury would still be allowed to retain the power of malicious injury in cases of maiming and murdering. Will the House believe

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

that until four years ago it was not even discovered that the Grand Jurors, except under the Coercion Acts, had that power, and they now only have that power in the case of any policeman injured in a riot, and in the case of a witness who may have given evidence for the Crown; so that the power as regards maiming and murdering is non-existent except in the most special cases. And, furthermore, in the very place where that power is needed more than anywhere else, the City of Belfast, where the Catholics were mowed down in 1886, and where policemen were shot and killed, that power does not exist at all. The widow of a constable, a most respectable woman with a helpless family, because that power does not exist, was left penniless until a grant was given from Her Majesty's Government. What is the power of the Grand Jury as regards malicious injury? They have this power, and a more mischievous power was never placed in the hands of irresponsible men, who do not pay one penny from their pockets. A haystack is burned. It is always the haystack of a land grabber. It is forgotten that the very fact that if the man came before a landlords' body and said that he was a land grabber, that is the very thing to get compensation at twice the ordinary rate of pay. There was the case of Mrs. Lucas—tried at Cork Assizes four years ago. She was the wife of a Grand Juror, the wife of a Magistrate of the County of Cork, and she was tried for arson—for pouring paraffin on the curtains, with her own babes in a cradle in the upper room. She got compensation from the Grand Jury for malicious injuries, on the ground that she was boycotted, and her husband himself was one of the Grand Jury. If there ever was a provision which worked injustice it is this provision with regard to malicious injury. When we wish for county reform in Ireland, and when we desire Grand Jury reform, which would get rid of this odious malicious injury system, which has worked so much injustice in the past, I would not give sixpence for a Bill which did not deal with this question. I shall be told by some gentlemen opposite that this presentment can be

traversed. Yes, it can be traversed before a Judge of Assize, one of the gentlemen who are to have the power of destroying these new County Boards. It may be traversed by cumbrous machinery. All the Judges, with two exceptions, I think, refused common juries in these cases. Who are the best judges, from the landlords' point of view, whether this Bill is a good one or not? The Irish landlords. And the Irish landlords assume, as a matter of course, by resolution of their Committee, that the Government would deal with this question of malicious injuries. Did the Landlords' Committee, or at any rate as many of the landlords who have intelligence, propose to deal with the subject? Did they imagine it would be left to the Grand Jury to continue to have this power? Then the Irish landlords are more extreme than the First Lord of the Treasury. They passed a resolution taking away from the Grand Jurors the power of malicious injuries, and they proposed to place it on the County Court Judge. So that, in the confession of the landlords themselves, the Government are taking a retrograde, and even a reactionary step. The other day the Member for South Tyrone had 300 bogus voters in his constituency. They were all allowed to go on, because the revising barrister refused to grant the objections, and the revising barrister got 100 guineas for doing that duty for the Member for South Tyrone. The Member for South Tyrone got him made a County Court Judge with £1,200 a year. For my own part, bad as the proposal of Her Majesty's Government is, I should regard the proposal of the Irish Landlords' Committee as far better than that which is in this Bill. It may be that the Government have made this Bill so bad as it is for the purpose of having Amendments made to it in Committee. They propose something awfully bad—so bad, that anything will be an improvement on it. Then when you propose something decent the Government will say, "Let us split the difference," and they give us something betwixt and between. That may be the idea working in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman. If it is, I will

say the whole Bill will want a new lock, a new stock, and a new barrel. I cannot conceive any portion of it which commends itself to the judgment of any section of Irish Members in the House. The mere fact of refusing to deal with malicious injuries, alone is a serious defect. To talk about other questions, the question of the franchise or the question of the cumulative vote, would, I think, be almost useless at the present moment. The only thing I wish to say is, I hope English Members will be instructed by the unanimity with which both sides of the Irish Party desire to preserve the illiterate vote. I saw in a pamphlet, sent out in England recently, the statement that the priests were at Cork in front of the booth with the crucifix. I never yet saw a priest with a crucifix anywhere outside his chapel. Therefore, so far as we are concerned, if you put in these illiterate voters in the interest of either section of the Irish Party both equally repudiate them. Certainly the last to make any proposition with regard to the illiterates should be the Conservative Party. You kept them in ignorance. You put the same price on the head of a schoolmaster as on the head of a wolf. You refused to allow us to deal with our schools, our schoolmasters, or with regard to the whole question of education, except upon some English plan. No doubt it suits the superfine English gentleman who has robbed the Church of this country, and given his children education at the expense of the poor, because, after all, the monasteries taught the poor, which you did not do in the Universities. You get your education at the expense of the poor in Oxford and Cambridge, but turn up your nose at some of us who have hardly got any school education. Whatever state of things prevail in Ireland is your handiwork. If an Irishman is ignorant and uncivilised—if, to use a famous phrase of the uncle of the First Lord of the Treasury, he is an Hottentot—for all these things he has to thank you and your Parliament. It is admirably instructive as to the true inwardness of the Tory Party in this latter end of the nineteenth century that, after having endured your rule for seven centuries,

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

you now propose to punish the men you have robbed and kept ignorant for their crimes.

(7.2.) **SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT** (Derby): My hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down rather objected I think to the statement made by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle, that we should not vote against the First Reading of this Bill. Now, I have one argument to address to my hon. and learned Friend which I think will have some weight. If we did not vote for the First Reading of this Bill, this Bill would never be printed. Now, our object should be to give the largest circulation that we possibly can to this Bill. I think we ought to have cheap editions of it; that the Liberal vans throughout the counties of England should be stocked with this Bill, that they should enable the illiterates of the rural districts—those people who are not fit for county government as we have heard so often—to form a true opinion of what the Government think county government ought to be in this country. Therefore, Sir, for my part, I should be disposed to take, at all events, the preliminary measure, which would enable the people of England to understand two things—first of all, the point of view from which Her Majesty's Government approach the treatment of the self-government of Ireland—treatment which, as a Gentleman below the Gangway said, amounts to this, that a more insulting Bill to the people of Ireland, more insulting in its provisions and in the manner in which it was presented, cannot be imagined. Why, it professes to be a great remedial measure for Ireland!

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR:** No, no!

**SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT:** I know you say it is not a self-government Bill, but it ought to be; it is the basis of all reconciliation between the English and Irish people; and I was going to say that it is not the provisions of this Bill alone, but it is the point of view and the tone of the right hon. Gentleman in presenting it which shows us what his conception is of the relations between England and Ireland, when he says that the Bill for the establishment of local self-government in Ireland is a trifling Bill compared with a Coercion

Bill, or a Bill for the making of light railways in Ireland. Well, I shall not, at all events, vote against the First Reading of this Bill, because I wish it to be published throughout the length and breadth of the land. Sir, if there is anybody who should desire to intercept this Bill, it should be the gentlemen who sat behind the right hon. Gentleman. Why does not he, after what I think he has seen of the opinion in this House, get some other noble Lord to perform the friendly office which was performed to this measure at the great Conservative meeting at Birmingham? Why, those delegates had a great deal more common sense than the Cabinet they were called upon to support. Why does he not get some friendly Member on these benches to move "the Previous Question," so as to relieve him of his own Bill? He might save them from the disaster which was contemplated at Birmingham. Sir, we cannot forget that this is a Birmingham Bill. The stamp of Birmingham liberalism it on its face. But where are its supporters? What has become of the Liberal Unionists Brigade? Why are they not here to "help the lame dog over the stile"? Talk of running away! He, the hon. Member for Bordesley (Mr. Jesse Collings), slunk out after them. But I must do this justice to the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, that in this judgment of Solomon he did not speak with the language of the true mother of the Bill. No, Sir, the mother of this Bill sat at the end of this Bench. I saw in his countenance how much he felt for the imminent fate of his infant. I would venture seriously to ask the right hon. Gentleman after we have paid him the decent compliment of reading his Bill a first time, guided very much by the considerations to which I have alluded, whether it is worth his while to waste this Session upon such a Bill as this? He has got a colleague, sitting next but one to him, who can tell him something about compensation, and what happened to the Compensation Bill. But, Sir, the Compensation Bill was a joke compared to this Bill; I should say that this is the worse joke of the two. I have a high opinion of the intelligence of the right hon. Gentleman. Does he really think

it is worth while wasting the time of the House of Commons with a Bill which it is using the mildest language to call an absurdity? Nobody can conceive seriously that a Government can propose for the acceptance of the House of Commons such a measure as this. It is not necessary to refer to any other clause than the notable clause of the trial of the County Council, *solvuntur risu tabulæ*. If the right hon. Gentleman will only take a sensible view of this matter I am perfectly willing to say to him *tu missus abibis*. But the trial of the County Council—may I be there to see it; it will be a spectacle such as, I think, has never been witnessed. When the two Judges have retired and have pronounced the County Council guilty, and the culprits are removed from the dock, then the Lord Lieutenant will produce a new County Council. Do you call that a Government that can produce to the ridicule of mankind such a measure as this as fulfilling the great offices of self government in this country? Well, now, Sir, I venture to speak only in the interests of Public Business, and I would entreat the right hon. Gentleman to have some compassion upon the House of Commons. You may carry a joke too far. It is all very well for one night. The right hon. Gentleman has afforded us excellent sport for a few hours before dinner, and we are very grateful to him; but if this farce is to be continued, if the time of the House is to be wasted on such rubbish as this, I think the sooner you send us to our constituents the better, because, depend upon it, they will not waste many weeks in forming a judgment upon this measure and disposing of it. Therefore I would really recommend the right hon. Gentleman to take his First Reading, and then to assure us that we shall hear no more of this Bill, and then go on with some business which is fitting for men of common sense.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have naturally listened with interest, I may say with entertainment, and possibly with profit, to the short conversational Debate which has occurred on the First Reading of this Bill, and I have noticed I think in the speeches of all the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who have attacked this measure a *parti*

*pris*—a pre-arrangement of opposition, which I think indicates that they had made up their minds how they were going to receive it long before our proposals were made to the House. I did not begin early enough to take notes of the speeches to have anything like a complete catalogue of the various contumelious epithets which have been heaped upon our proposal. One hon. Member described the Bill as “contemptible”; another as “an insult”; a third as “a sham”; a fourth as “wrong from the crown of its head to the sole of its foot” another as “a monstrous imposture.” An Irish Member who knows a great deal about these things said that it would take as long to pass as the Coercion Act, and the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down threatened us with the same kind of opposition which he led with such brilliant courage against the Licensing Bill of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. and learned Member for Longford seems to think that this Bill is of extraordinary character—that it must have been brought in by arrangement with one of the wings of the Irish Party.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I did not say anything of the kind.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That violent and eccentric hypothesis has been advanced by the hon. and learned Gentleman to account for such a measure being produced. The hon. Gentleman said we wanted to capture one of the wings of the Irish Party.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I never said anything of the kind. I said the right hon. Gentleman must have hoped to do so, for a colleague of his own (the Solicitor General for England) indicated that in a speech of his.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, Sir, I am sorry to say I had no more subtle or sinister designs in bringing forward this Bill than those which I have explained in my speech. I endeavoured, without colouring the matter one way or other, to explain to the House the advantages that would be derived by Ireland from local government, and I do not for a moment pretend that more than those advantages would follow from this or from any other Local Government Bill. It was not I who said that this would

settle the Irish question, or that any other conceivable Bill would settle the Irish question. It was not I who said or pretended that it would bring into harmony those parties who have so long disturbed Irish politics. These are sentiments put into my mouth by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and which derive no colour whatever from anything I have said before. I want the House and the country to understand in a word what is the character of the Bill that has been so treated. The Bill agrees with the English and the Scotch Bills in handing over the management of county government to Councillors elected by an absolutely democratic vote, if that is the word; a vote not differing essentially from the vote by which Members of this House are returned. It agrees with the Scotch Bill in handing over to the County Councils so elected management of sanitary affairs as well as the management of roads, asylums, and other matters of that kind. The County Councils and the Baronial Councils elected by this wide suffrage have absolute control over the ordinary management of their ordinary affairs. The only limit put upon them with regard to the works they shall undertake is a limit which has already been imposed in Scotland, and which, so far as I know, has never been described as either rendering the Scotch system inefficacious or unjust, or Scotchmen who have adopted it either slaves or Hottentots. So far as the broad divisions of the Bill are concerned, they are taken from the measure you have already passed for England and Scotland. I admit there is one clause dealing with the power of suspending the County Councils—not treating them criminally, as the right hon. Gentleman, without the slightest warrant, chooses to suppose. There is a provision by which, after judicial inquiry by a tribunal which has been thought strong enough to decide whether a Member shall sit in this House, and to determine whether constituencies shall return a Member to this House; before that tribunal we have proposed, and we think we are right in proposing, that cases of corruption, malversation, and oppression should be tried. In what sense

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

is that an insult to the Irish people? In what sense is that a limit to the true powers of the County Councils in Ireland? Will it be maintained by any human being that a County Council, not guilty of oppression or malversation, or corruption, will be found by two Irish elected Judges to be unworthy of continuing in office? It will not be so found. No man believes for one moment that the verdict of a tribunal like that would be an unjust verdict. Therefore, the only possibility of the prophecy in which the right hon. Gentleman indulged of the County Council standing before such a Judge, and hearing his unfavourable opinion of their conduct, must depend upon the fact that in the judgment of the right hon. Gentleman County Councils in Ireland will be guilty of malversation and corruption. Except in that event the clause in the Bill would have, and ought to have, no operation. In that event, who will deny that we are bound to find some method by which laches like this can be dealt with? I wish the House, and I wish the country, to judge from this Debate what amount of sincerity there is in the cry sent up by hon. Gentlemen for Local Government in Ireland. Those cries are branded from the first with the stamp of insincerity by the speeches we have heard. The Member for Longford said it was not worth while discussing this Bill, which did not alter the existing law with regard to compensation for malicious injuries. What was that to do with Local Government in Ireland? (An hon. MEMBER: Why do you give it to the Grand Juries?) We do not alter the law. Because we bring in a Bill to deal with County Government in Ireland, and in addition did not also happen to deal with the reform of the Grand Jury Law relating to compensation for malicious injuries, therefore these lovers of Local Government, these people who desire that the ordinary ratepayers should have complete management of their own affairs, will not look at the Bill. They say it is contemptible, it is ridiculous, it is a sham. Is it not certain that a man who can deliberately reject a Bill, which, on the widest possible franchise, does give complete control to counties of

their affairs, such as is given in Scotland, and who rejects that Bill because it does not go outside the province of Local Government and deal with the perfectly alien question of malicious injuries, is perfectly indifferent to Local Government? The right hon. Gentleman opposite advised me to drop this Bill at once, and tells me that they are going to offer a kind of obstructive opposition, such as has been offered by them on previous occasions, and that the whole Session will be wasted if we deal with this question at all. Are they going to pose about the country as the friends of Local Government? This Bill, at all events, gives to the Irish ratepayer what he has never had—complete power to manage his own affairs. If you reject, as you say you are going to reject, this Bill; if you render it impossible, as you say you will make it impossible, for us to pass this Bill, you will postpone indefinitely the privileges which the Government propose to give to the Irish ratepayers and taxpayers, as they have already given them to the people of England and Scotland. But if you think you are going to reap political advantage by going about the country denouncing us for having introduced a clause in this Bill by which a County Council in Ireland which oppresses is not to be allowed to exist any longer—if you think you are going to make political capital out of the statement that we have dared to introduce a clause in this measure by which the weak and the poor are to be protected from the numerous and the strong, I think you will make nothing of that. There is not a platform in this country, nor an audience in this country, before whom I could not go bearing in my hand instances in which popular bodies in Ireland have already shown what, under circumstances and under some temptation, they are capable of. I ask the English people whether we should not be acting criminally towards the minority in Ireland if we did not extend some protection to them? In the meanwhile, I can only take note of the declarations that have been made. I interpret those declarations as a distinct statement on the part both of the official Leaders of the Opposition and of those who repre-



sent both sections of the Nationalist Party below the Gangway, that they mean to use every Party weapon they can command to prevent this Bill becoming law. I take note that the only reason they do that is because we introduce machinery to stop corruption and oppression, and I draw from it the inference that it is not freedom and not Local Government they care for, but the desire to make something out of the County Councils. They desire and expect to be able if this provision is not introduced into the Bill to use the powers of the Council either for corruption or for oppression, and for carrying on the cause of the Party of which they are the representatives.

(7.27.) MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.): The insulting observations of the right hon. Gentleman are very simply and very shortly dealt with by asking him if the provisions were so salutary why were they not applied to England and to Scotland? The right hon. Gentleman finds that the Irish Members of all sections are opposed to this Bill. The reason is a very simple one. It is because this Bill is drawn on the assumption that for some reason or another Irishmen are inferior to Englishmen and Scotchmen. So long as the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Members in this House mean to legislate for Ireland on the assumption that Ireland is inferior to England and Scotland in any respect, so long will their measures meet with every opposition that it is possible for Irish Members to give them.

\*(7.32.) MR. KNOX (West Cavan): I want to know why it is that the hon. Members for North Armagh and North Down are not present during this discussion? The only explanation of this extraordinary event is that they are engaged in organising the poor and the weak in Ulster against the oppression which would be possible under this Bill.

MR. MACARTNEY (South Antrim): My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Armagh is suffering from influenza.

\*MR. KNOX: I am very sorry to hear that. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that these provisions are inserted in the Bill, because the Irish people have shown

that they have been guilty of a corruption which English and Scotch people have not been guilty of. Have we heard of the Metropolitan Board of Works? In the Capital City of the Kingdom—a city which is the hotbed of Toryism—you had a spectacle of corruption which you have never equalled in the poorest Board of Guardians in Ireland. You talk of political corruption! The man whom hon. Members opposite wish to be styled Mayor of Belfast, who was to have the entertainer of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury on his visit to that town, is a member of a firm of contractors, and his partners tenders for contracts under the Corporation of Belfast. He says he has some arrangement with his partner in which the profits do not go into the Lord Mayor's pocket. But neither the Corporations of Dublin or Cork, or any other city in Ireland, would have contracts to the partner of their Magistrate. That is the one case declared open and scandalous conduct which you can find anywhere of in the Local Government of Ireland. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether this provision is specially inserted in order to prevent the Mayor of Belfast from giving contracts to his partner? Then, what about the poor and the weak? We used to hear of the wealth and intelligence of our opponents, of their strong rights which were going to resist any measure of Home Rule for Ireland. Your opponents in Ireland, on behalf of whom you refused for the last six years to even the rudimentary rights of citizenship to the vast mass of the people of the land, are, after all, so poor and weak that you have to invent a scheme of checks and balances and safeguards different to anything that has ever been seen in any other Local Government Bill. The people of Ireland are fit for Local Government, but they are not fit for the Local Government proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. I do not see the wisdom of setting up an elaborate sham. We do not make an exception to any provision which puts down corruption and oppression, but we do take exception to the monstrous proposal to give the Judges the right to punish the County Council

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

Ireland because they opposed the Conservative Party. We shall offer to his Bill the most decided and determined opposition; and as the Bill must be a complicated one, and as the statutes dealing with Local Government are numerous, it will be possible for us to oppose this Bill in a way which may exceedingly embarrass Her Majesty's Government. There will be no difficulty in drawing Amendments which would occupy no small part of the time of this Session; and if my hon. Friends sitting around me are of the same opinion I think the Government will hesitate to press on this measure in the face of the opposition which it will encounter.

(7.37.) MR. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Farrow): I decline to express any opinion on the Bill till I have seen it. I am mainly in consequence of the indignation, real or assumed, expressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby and other speakers. One would suppose that the Members for Derby and Newcastle had never heard of local governing bodies being controlled by the Courts of Law. I know of no Local Government, either past or present, which is not directly subjected to the control of the Courts of Law. It is the common practice for applications to be made to the Court of Queen's Bench to keep justices within their proper jurisdiction, and to get them to discharge their duty; and when they fail to discharge their duty you can get a *mandamus* to compel them to do so. If after this they do not discharge their duty, they could be adjudged by the Court to be guilty of contempt of Court. We need not go into ancient history. We have had a recent instance in which the London County Council had to obey a *mandamus* of the Queen's Bench on a question of licensing. What hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to have lost sight of is this fact—that you must make the local governing authorities subject to the control of the executive, not of the Imperial Government. If that is not done, then Local Government ceases to be Subordinate Government. There is nothing new in this, except that the new tribunal proposed to have the power of dissolving County Councils. In principle it

is the same, for the local governing bodies are subject to the control of Her Majesty's Superior Courts.

(7.42.) MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I have observed that whenever a Tory Bill is brought in you always have a Tory lawyer to swear it is part of the Constitution. Let me tell the hon. and learned Gentleman that he may talk as he pleases, but he must realise himself that the Liberals would never consent that an elective representative assembly should be subordinate to any judicial tribunal in this country. The judicial tribunals are subordinate to all local bodies that have rights to legislate. But I do not rise to reply to the hon. and learned Gentleman. I rise to express my sympathy with the First Lord of the Treasury. I think he has been most cruelly treated by hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. They have not considered the difficulty of his position. The right hon. Gentleman found himself between a certain Personage and the deep sea. Why has not the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham manifested his interest in the Bill? The right hon. Gentleman has for years demanded and insisted that the pledge of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington should be fulfilled, and that some sort of local government for Ireland should be brought in by the present Ministry. The First Lord of the Treasury had to submit to this. He knew he could call himself the Leader of the House, but he had a master, and the master was sitting here. The hon. Gentleman writhed under the supremacy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, but they were obliged to accept it, because if they did not they knew they would no longer have a majority in the House. Here is the right hon. Gentleman in this position, and I am sorry to see the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby and others trampling him under foot. The right hon. Gentleman has had to satisfy two different parties. He had to satisfy the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham by bringing in a Local Government Bill, and he had to satisfy Gentlemen behind him by bringing in a sham Local Government Bill. I never saw a more pitiable position of a Leader of the House.

He was on his knees not to the Opposition, but to hon. Gentlemen behind him, with one after another of what he was pleased to call safeguards. He looked disparagingly round to see if there was no cheer, and if there was not sufficient, then he would give another safeguard; and, showing that the Bill was a humbug and a sham, the right hon. Gentleman would have gone on putting in safeguards if his friends had desired it. I must call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to his position. He has been called by the Member for Derby the mother of this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman complained that my right hon. Friend had not stated his views with regard to this Bill. We know that this Bill is the child of the right hon. Gentleman, and I should like to hear this eminent former Radical explain his views on the different clauses of the Bill. Let him tell us what he approves of and what he disapproves of, because I never know what the Government are going to do until I hear the words of the right hon. Gentleman. Why are we to be tormented, I ask the First Lord of the Treasury, by these sham Bills? Why not take the advice, which is exceedingly well meant, and send us back to our constituents? Either you have a majority in the country or you have not. If you have not, you have no business here. If you have, you will come back with redoubled force. It is too ridiculous to waste time on a Bill like this, or on any Local Government Bill, with regard to Ireland, considering that the great issue which must be submitted to the country is, whether there is to be Home Rule or not, and in the event of the country deciding that there was to be Home Rule, we shall be wasting our time, for it will be for the Irish Parliament, not for us, to decide what are to be the provisions of Local Government in the different counties.

(7.50.) MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): Sir, I am induced to say a few words on this stage of the Debate by the appeal of the hon. Member for Northampton. I think it exceedingly undesirable that credulous people should take for truth what the hon. Member has just said. The hon. Member is entirely mistaken

in saying that I have insisted, either in public or in private, upon the introduction of a Local Government Bill for Ireland. I took note in the early part of this Parliament of the intention of the Government to introduce such a Bill. I have approved of that intention, and I have counted upon its fulfilment, but I have never insisted upon anything. The hon. Member does me altogether too much credit in imagining that I am in any way responsible for the clauses of this Bill. I understand in the course of my absence from the House for five minutes my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derby took the opportunity of making an attack upon me, which I am assured was in his very best and latest Whitechapel style. I am told that my right hon. Friend complained that I had slunk out of the House for fear apparently of the onslaught which he was about to make upon me.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said in fear of the Bill.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I should like to assure my right hon. Friend that it was not because I was afraid of him. I had no idea that in his present retiring mood he would be likely to take a prominent part in this Debate, and certainly I never anticipated that he would attack anybody when that person was in a position to reply to him. I had not intended, unless these appeals had been made, to take any part in the discussion on the First Reading, because, following the example so often set by the greatest authorities in the House, I desired to see the Bill in print before pronouncing any opinion upon it. What I should like to consider, in the first instance, when I do see the Bill, is, what are the privileges which it confers upon the popular and representative local authorities it is going to create? If these privileges are as complete as I understand the First Lord to say, then I shall be inclined to regard with a favourable eye a measure which does for Ireland what similar measures have done for England and Scotland. As I understand, the opposition to the Bill has turned upon the safeguards which the right hon. Gentleman announced will be found in the Bill. I want to know

Mr. La'bouchere

whether hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House—I do not say hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, but from England and Scotland—consider that any safeguards are at all necessary? Are they prepared to give to these local authorities in Ireland, which will be elected, so far as the vast majority of their members are concerned by one party, full control over the property of the minority?

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; says the hon. Gentleman. My hon. Friend is perfectly willing to give to the majority full right over the property of the minority, but I am appealing, not to my hon. Friend, as he takes somewhat extreme views of these questions, but to the majority of the Party on this side of the House. I think I have heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, and if I have not heard him I have read articles written by him, in which he has pointed out the immense danger of conferring upon bodies similar in composition to Boards of Guardians in Ireland those powers over the property of the minority. I imagine that the right hon. Gentleman would agree that some kind of safeguard is necessary. When we get the Bill we shall see what the safeguards are—whether they are sufficient—or whether any alternative may be found. As I understand, the main safeguard, and the one spoken of as an insult to Ireland, is a safeguard which the Americans, the most democratic and independent people in the world, have introduced into their Constitution. At the present time in America there is no Legislature in the country, no one of those self-governing States, which may not be, in the absurd and theatrical words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, put into the dock and judged by a judicial tribunal.

MR. J. MORLEY: And suppressed?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No, not suppressed. My right hon. Friend will not get off; I am coming to the suppression directly. The charge of the right hon. Gentleman against the Government was, that they were going to put

County Councils in Ireland in the dock. No matter what the penalty was to be if convicted, the insult was that they were going to put them in the dock. I say in exactly the same way as these Councils might be put in the dock, the Legislatures of every State in the United States may be brought before the Supreme Court and put into the dock, and their acts declared to be *ultra vires*. The second objection is taken not to the method, which, in my opinion, is perfectly justifiable, and practically the same as the method adopted in this country. As the hon. and learned Gentleman has just said, it is perfectly true that every County and every Municipal Council in this country is subject to a judicial tribunal, and may be ordered by *mandamus* to undo its work; and if it does not fulfil the orders of the Court, what happens to it? It is not suppressed; no, but it is put into prison. I think it may fairly be said that in that way County or Municipal Councils in this country may be put into the dock and tried for their lives almost, and be imprisoned if they do not obey the orders of the judicial tribunal. But the complaint is that this judicial tribunal would have the power of suppressing the council. I do not know until I see the Bill what the provisions are. I should like to know whether or not it is intended, that having before it a case of oppression or wrongdoing on the part of the Council the Judicial tribunal is thereupon immediately to make an order for its suppression, or is, in the first instance, to give it an opportunity of undoing the wrong it has done? I do not gather from the speech of the First Lord which is the case. I should myself prefer that any Council being in this position should have an opportunity of undoing what it has done. But if it refuses to do that, and is in contempt of the Court, I see no hardship, no insult, no wrong to any class in Ireland in ordering its suppression, and in substituting for it, at all events for a time, persons who will carry on the work under the orders of the Court. I did not intend to take part in this Debate, but I hope it will be considered I have clearly and sufficiently answered the appeal that was made to me.

MR. J. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The illustrations the right hon. Gentleman has given requires some immediate reply, as they may mislead some of those who are not familiar with the facts from which they are drawn. The illustrations were of the most absurd and indefensible provision of the Bill, and they were twofold. The first was the case of a *mandamus* which may issue against any Public Body in this country, and the second was the case of the United States. Now a *mandamus* issues in both England and Ireland when a Public Body disobeys the law. The Superior Courts are bound to see that the inferior Executive Bodies obey general law, and in dealing with cases certain rules are laid down for the observance of the Judges. What we complain of is that the Government is not content to rely upon these provisions of the general law, not content to rely upon the well understood functions and traditions defined and ascertained by centuries of usage in England, but proposes to set up a perfectly novel and exceptional procedure. The illustration of the United States is very wide of the mark. I should like to hear what any American, not a lawyer, would say if he had had the good fortune to be in the Gallery during the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He would more than ever believe, what Americans are in the habit of saying, that there is no place where American institutions are less understood than in the country from which they are derived. The right hon. Gentleman says that the case here is exactly parallel to that of the United States. He says that in the United States there is no Legislature which may not be brought to book and tried by a judicial tribunal in the same way as the County Council is proposed to be dealt with.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I did not say that. I did not say it was exactly the same, or that the consequences would be the same.

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman certainly used the word "exact," and conveyed that impression. Will the House believe that there is absolutely no power whatever in any American Court to arraign or deal with the act of any Legislature at all? No

American Court has any power to do anything but this, to administer the general law of the land, the highest law of the land. Hon. Members will, perhaps, pardon me if I enter on what may seem to be a disquisition on a technical point to explain the matter. The highest law of the land is the Constitution of the United States, and the Statutes made under the authority of the Constitution, within the scope of Congressional power. If any Legislature transgresses the Constitution of the United States, or any of these Statutes, that Act may be, in a private cause arising between private parties, adjudged to be null and void. If any Legislature passes any Act by which a private right is interfered with in contravention of the Constitution, in a case between two private parties, it is competent for any Court to decide that that Act ought not to have been passed. Is there any similarity whatever in this? Anyone who has listened to the right hon. Gentleman would have supposed that the Legislature would be censured and dissolved in analogy with this Bill. Mr. Speaker, so far from this being the case, no State Legislature can be imprisoned, and no civil suit brought against it except by another State—not by a private individual—and so far from there being anything approaching an executive and administrative jurisdiction of this kind, such things have never been suggested for a moment in the United States, and nothing exists there beyond the power which exists in this country to pronounce a bye-law, passed by a Legislature in excess of its proper jurisdiction, null and void. The American Courts can only do that which our Courts can do. I will go a little further, and say that the provision in this Bill receives its very strongest condemnation from the practice of the United States. In America there have been attempts to throw non-judicial functions on the Judges, but the Judges have always declined to exercise them, on the ground that they would lose the confidence which they at present enjoy in the exercise of their duties, and that view is sanctioned by the Constitution of every State in the Union, and has been upheld in innumerable cases. The reason

why, above all things, we are entitled to object to this proposal which the Government has made to combine judicial and executive work on the Judges, is that it tends to increase and aggravate the worst feature of the Irish social question. What we have said is that the antagonism which exists between the Judges and the people in Ireland, and the distrust of the administration of the law, would be greatly aggravated if our Judges became associated with what they consider is oppression. They look on the Judges as being too subservient to the Executive, and not sufficiently independent. That has been the constant difficulty in Irish government, and that is the danger which the present proposal of the Government tends to accentuate. The right hon. Gentleman tried to fix us with the alternative of proposing that if we did not desire to entrust this to Irish Judges it was because we believed that County Councils would never be wrong, or if oppressive ought not to be punished. Mr. Speaker, it is not, and I think the right hon. Gentleman must feel that it is not, such a view that has been expressed from these Benches. What we have said is this: that the antagonism between the Judges and people in Ireland, and the distrust of the administration of the law, would be greatly increased and aggravated if it were put into the power of any minority, however small, in a Local Authority to raise questions of this wide, vague, and indefinite character before a judicial tribunal, to accuse a County Council of oppression, and leave the decision of that question, not to any provision of law, or anything you can find in the Statutes, but to the view any two Judges might take as to what was oppression of the minority. No proposal can be more opposed to the best traditions of English Government, or can work more disastrously for the welfare of Ireland. We can desire nothing better than to have an opportunity, I hope we shall have it soon, for arguing the question at greater length than can be done to-night.

(8.40.) SIR JOHN COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.): I should like to say that there are two statements of fact mentioned by the hon. Member

for Longford which, in my judgment, are really not exactly accurate. He said, in the first place, that in Ireland the whole of the county cess is paid by the tenant. Now the Act of 1870, which is the law of the land, provided that in all cases of new tenancies the landlord should pay half of the county cess; and I know that on many properties where the tenants are numerous the landlord, by arrangement, does pay the whole of the county cess. Therefore the statement is not strictly accurate. The other statement was where the hon. Member charged the Union with having created illiterates. I would remind the House that this Imperial Parliament has been more generous to Ireland than to England itself, because 20 years before an Education Act was passed for England such an Act was passed for Ireland. The question before the House is, Whether we shall have submitted for consideration—

"A measure for the establishing of County Councils in Ireland founded upon representative principles, and framed with the double aim of confirming popular control over expenditure, and supplying a yet more serious want by extending the formation of habits of local self-government."

We are asked to allow to be introduced into this House a Bill for that purpose, and the words I have used to describe the measure is a just description of it. I have found the words I have used in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech from the Throne in 1881, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was one of Her Majesty's Ministers, and now we are told by him that to introduce for the consideration of this House such a measure is worse than a bad joke. I think the concluding observation in it is one of the strongest arguments for County Government of Ireland. I think the regeneration of Ireland depends upon such education; and so long as the present system continues I can see no prospect of an improved condition of Ireland which will be of a permanent character. It is utterly impossible to suppose that you can carry on a system of local taxation where the taxes are paid by one class and administered absolutely by another. Therefore I am forced into this position, and I am now

speaking as a friend of Ireland, and not in any Party sense, when I declare this to be a necessary educational process, which I hope will produce good results upon the people of Ireland in regard to educating individuals in the duties of public affairs. At the present stage it would be impossible to deal with the details of the Bill. I only rose to point out one matter, that I have not heard referred to in the course of this Debate. It is in reference to the establishment of safeguards. I think exceptional and strong safeguards are necessary in Ireland. Granting that popular Local Bodies in Ireland in absolute power will be no worse and no better than similar bodies in England, assuming that for the sake of argument, there is exceptional reason why extra and special safeguards should be introduced when you are passing for the first time a Local Government Bill for Ireland. The safeguards are necessary for owners of property who are in the minority in that country. Against the interests of property history records that repeated attacks have been made. It has been the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and the policy of the Unionist Party, in every way possible to increase the number of owners of property in Ireland. This process is only in the commencement; and although the owners are few and in the minority, nothing should be done to make the position of owners of land, whether in large or in small portions, more difficult than at present. This House has on the recommendations of a Unionist Government, applied a large amount of State money for the purpose of encouraging occupiers to become owners. Now, Sir, if you establish a system of Local Government which provides no safeguards, and which, therefore, places in the hands of the vast majority—many of them ignorant of public affairs—power to oppress and to make the position of the landowners more difficult, you will largely deter occupiers from becoming owners, and in spite of all the trouble this House has gone to, the large sums of State money appropriated by Parliament for the purpose of converting occupiers into owners

*Sir John Colomb*

would be absolutely useless. If I do not have safeguards the Government machinery may be by the large majority, who are occupied in deterring occupiers from becoming purchasing tenants. I have had conversations with many men in different parts of Ireland who are occupiers wish to become owners, and I find one of the chief things which men from purchasing is the fear of any of the advantages the purchasing tenants would derive would be swallowed up by additional tax. I found their answer was generally this, when I asked them whether they had any intentions to purchase. "While the terms are good we are like to become purchasing tenants, but we do not know" may be the result to ourselves owners with regard to taxation of under Home Rule or popular control. Now, I hold that this uncertainty of fear has prevented occupiers becoming purchasing tenants, and by County Government you alter the present system, they at once see they are uncertain as to the effect of taxation. Therefore, in the interests of the purchasing tenants I think you must adopt essentially a system and even exceptional safeguards in Ireland for the purpose of protecting, not the great landlords, who are able to protect themselves, or ought to be, but for the purpose of protecting small owners who will be in danger by this. For my part I will give the Bill my hearty support. I can understand the position of hon. Members of any Party opposite saying they will not even discuss this measure nor even submit to a discussion of a measure for extending Local Government to Ireland, when it is a reference to the measure of 1881 to which I referred. It means that they will not do now what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby proposed to do in 1881. I give the Government credit for having introduced the Bill, and say that I am upon county government as the means of educating public opinion in Ireland up to the level of forming a body of capable self government.

55.) MR. EDMUND LEAMY (Co. S.): The First Lord has been of a pre-arrangement of opposition which I fail to discover. I wish to express my own opinion and the opinion of others sitting upon these Benches, that we were looking forward, with very much hope, to the introduction of a Bill that would confer self-government upon Ireland, and that Bill were one which could be accepted by the Irish people, I, for one, should only be too happy to support it. It did not require, as far as I could see, any pre-arrangement, or organization, or consultation, to enable Gentlemen on these Benches to come to the conclusion that the Bill would be a failure, and that, if placed upon the White Book, it would be another death-blow to the Irish people. What, I should ask, is the use of the County Councils under the provisions of this Bill? We are told of corruption; we are told that they might oppress, if you look to the provisions, you will see that there is no opportunity for oppression, and, I think, none for corruption. The Bill is a ambiguous substitute for the present system. I do not know whether it has been pointed out that not only are the Magistrates to be given the power of finding the County Council guilty, and so dismissing them, but that power to substitute Magistrates is given the Lord Lieutenant, so that you therefore punish the people for wrong done by the County Council themselves. I could understand, on the County Council being dissolved, that a new election should be held and other members sent in the place of those who have been removed; but this proposal I cannot understand. The only point that appears to me to be of any use, or to recommend itself, is that which confers powers on the County Councils to look after and protect the woods and plantations of Ireland. I am sure there is no Irishman who does not regret what has taken place during the last few years, and I believe that the first work that an Irish Parliament would set itself to do would be the afforesting of Ireland. Now, I am perfectly satisfied that, if this Bill is carried into law against the wills of the Irish Representatives, the people will not

take any advantage of it. What on earth would be the good of allowing a County Council to decide whether a road should be repaired or not? because, under the provisions regarding the Standing Committee, the County Council could not make a new road without the permission of the Standing Committee. We have been told that a Standing Committee exists in the Scotch and English Bills. That is quite true; but under the English Bill the Standing Committee have the power of appointing the Chief Officer of Police, of deciding the number and pay of the police, and the police are under the authority of the Standing Committee. I do not know what the idea of my hon. Friends around me may be on the subject, but for my part I think the Bill should be allowed to be read a first time. I agree that it would be a good thing for the Bill to be printed, because it would show the country the utter ineptitude of the First Lord of the Treasury to legislate for Ireland, and enable one to see what is really wanted in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman comes down to pass this measure without consulting the majority of the Representatives of the Irish people; but having consulted the minority, and having fallen in with their views on every single point, which are we know, with one or two exceptions, opposed to granting Local Government to Ireland. Surely it is no wonder that we should denounce this Bill as a sham; and I must say that, during my experience of 11 or 12 years in this House, I never saw a man standing on the Treasury Bench in such a state of excitement as the First Lord of the Treasury was while he was introducing this Bill. While looking at the excited state of mind of the First Lord of the Treasury this evening as I listened to him, and observed the tone of his voice and his attitude, I confess I was puzzling my mind as to whether he was really sincere in placing the measure before the House, and whether he intends to go on with it. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to go on with it; but I think the right hon. Gentleman might find some instruction in the unanimous opposition which is offered to his measure by the Irish Members on



these Benches, and might, perhaps, come to the conclusion that it might be as well to save the time of the House and go on with some other Bill which might be passed during the present Session, and which might be of advantage to some other part of the Empire.

\*(9.5.) MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green): In the course of the speech delivered by the First Lord of the Treasury he said that, with regard to certain proposed safeguards in this Bill, he would have no objection to go on English platforms and tell the people that we had objected to the provisions which would prevent malversation, corruption, and oppression in Ireland by some of these newly-constituted authorities. Well, perhaps we would have no objection to his doing so; but I can tell the Members of this House that that game has been tried before now on English platforms, and the result has been very unsatisfactory for those who attempted it. He wants to know why we object to these proposed safeguards. We object, because we consider the proposal offensive, unnecessary, and grossly insulting to the Irish people. We object to it because we consider that it gives colour, or would give colour, to some of the most hateful, most unjust, and most bitter accusations and allegations that have been launched by some of our political opponents against the masses of the Irish people. It contemplates oppression, and it safeguards some persons or other—I cannot imagine who they are—against oppression. And we say that the introduction of such a clause into this Bill is offensive and is an insult, and to the best of our ability we shall oppose and reject it. We object to be branded in this way—to be branded as persons inclined to malversation, and corruption, and oppression—no such clause was introduced into the English or Scotch Bills. We have been told that so long as nothing of this kind was attempted, this clause could have no application, and no harm could be done by its introduction; but if there is any value or force in that argument, it would apply equally to the introduction of such a clause into the English and Scotch Bills. But there is no such clause in those Bills, and I am perfectly sure that neither

the English nor the Scotch people would submit to it. And, moreover, in that way you might justify the most hateful, and useless, and irritating provisions that can possibly be put into the legislation of any country. This clause goes upon the ground that we are a people not to be trusted, that we are uncivilised—at all events, not up to the mark of other people—thus we are an ill-conditioned, uneducated set of people. I recognise in this clause the hand of Lord Salisbury. I call that the Salisbury Clause of the Local Government Bill. It is in perfect keeping with the speech of the noble Lord—not one, but several speeches. We have been compared to the noble Lord the Prime Minister—Hottentots, to leopards, and to wolves—and I say this: that it is that spirit of that inspiration which I believe to be in this portion of the Local Government Bill. I consider this measure is ill-advised. I think it is not a wholehearted measure. I think it is a pallid measure. I doubt that the promoters and parents of it have the slightest idea that it will ever pass in the House of Commons; and regarding it as such, do, and as I believe the Irish people will regard it, we shall do our best to defeat it and to render it absolutely nugatory. I would say, in conclusion, that I think the system of forcing so-called remedial measures on the Irish people against the will of their Representatives in this House has already proved a failure more than once, and it appears to me that it will be sure to prove a failure again in this instance if it be tried.

\*(9.15.) MR. JAMES A. RENTOUL (Down, E.): I would not have risen to speak in this Debate were it not for the fact that hints have been thrown out from several quarters that a measure of Local Government for Ireland would meet with a certain amount of opposition from hon. Members on this side of the House, and that the First Lord of the Treasury would have very great difficulty in dealing with us. I have not found that any such difficulty is likely to exist. I came in contact with many very large audiences in England, and I have not spoken on any platform whatever on which I did not treat of this question

*Mr. Edmund Leamy*

of the Local Government Bill, and I declared that I believed that the Government was about to introduce a Local Government Bill for Ireland as wide, or wider even, than the Local Government Bill for England; and on every occasion the gentlemen on those platforms, so far as I can recollect, applauded that sentiment. Therefore, it appears to me that any hon. Member sitting on this side of the House who allowed me to make a statement in favour of this Bill on his platform is pledged to support this Bill. I mention this as a proof of the fact that I, for one, have not heard of any opposition likely to be given from this side of the House, but that the Bill will receive the cordial and hearty support of all my colleagues around me without exception. And I could hardly imagine it to be otherwise, because the Unionist Members for Ireland are, every one of them, in favour of this Bill, and I could hardly understand that the English Members of Parliament sitting on the same side of the House would turn their backs on a Bill which the Ulster Unionist Members support. I have not spoken with many of the Ulster Members since the First Lord made his speech this evening, but I feel certain they will support this Bill, because I have discussed with nearly every one of them the probable nature of the coming Bill, and this Bill seems likely to be more satisfactory to them than the Bill they thought the First Lord would bring in. That is to say, this Bill contains greater safeguards than we ever expected, and I think we would have been prepared to receive a Bill with less safeguards if it had been introduced. I took the opportunity in the Long Vacation of visiting all the 32 counties of Ireland. I met with members of the Grand Juries of every one of these 32 counties, and I discussed with them the probable provisions of the coming Bill, and I found their views were extremely reasonable, and, with one solitary exception, I did not meet or converse with a single Grand Juror who was not prepared to receive a wide and generous measure of Local Government such as the First Lord of the Treasury has

brought in. 'I think it will be admitted by Irish Members on both sides of the House that it is necessary to have some controlling power over the County Councils. I believe hon. Members opposite would not like to entrust the Orange County Council of Down, for example, with the uncontrolled management of the affairs of the Roman Catholic population; and I think, on the other hand, that the Unionists might be afraid to entrust the Nationalist County Council of Tipperary, for example, with the uncontrolled management of the affairs of their co-religionists in the South. Consequently, I think we must all agree that some sort of power, able to exercise its authority over the Councils in the different counties, would be a right and proper thing. Whether that controlling power should be exactly on the lines the First Lord of the Treasury had sketched might be questioned. There are other methods that could be applied that I think might be equally efficacious and possibly more satisfactory. But I, for one, could not certainly distrust the decision of two Irish Judges who have power to try an election petition, and who are selected not at random, but as having had long experience at the Bar, and as having risen to the top of their profession. I think these men might be trusted to deal fairly with a small matter such as a County Council or a question of Local Government when they are entrusted at present to deal with the honour and honesty of a Member of this House. It is perfectly clear that no County Council would be arraigned before these two Judges unless there was a strong *prima facie* case made out; and when a County Council is brought before two Judges surely everyone might trust to their justice and sense of right to do that which is right and proper. With reference to the cumulative vote proposal for the protection of the minority, I myself do not think that any reasonable scheme can be invented for the protection of minorities. Take the County Tipperary. I have discussed the question with a number of leading gentlemen there, and all of them were of opinion that no possible safeguard, no sort of franchise, no sort of cumulative voting would possibly bring to

Tipperary County Council any but the merest fraction of Unionists.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not intend the cumulative vote to give the minorities a larger representation than they are entitled to according to their numbers. All I intended was that it would enable them to be heard in the County Councils in proportion to the number that they bore in the constituencies.

\*MR. RENTOUL: I perfectly understood the right hon. Gentleman, but I may mention that, in the County Tipperary, as a leading Grand Juror told me, by no possible system that could be devised could the Tipperary County Council, made up, say, of 30 members altogether, be made to contain more than one or two Unionist members, and I think that these one or two members had better not be there. I say that deliberately. I myself am a member of the largest County Council, and I am unfortunately in a minority, and I know from experience that the minority in the London County Council have absolutely on all burning questions no sort of power whatever. In fact, I think they act as an irritant on the other members; and, possibly, the progressive members of the London County Council would not have gone to the lengths they have gone on certain questions if the minority had not been there. I am of opinion that two or three Unionists in the Tipperary County Council of 30 would be likely to do very little good to themselves or to anybody else. I am distinctly of opinion that in a thoroughly Home Rule county such as Tipperary the Home Rulers in the County Council will have it all their own way; and I think that equally in a county like Antrim, for example, the Unionists will have it all their own way. Therefore, with a few exceptions, in all Ireland—possibly in Tyrone County Council, for instance, where the members may be pretty equally balanced—the County Councils will have an overwhelming majority of members on the one side or the other; and whether it would conduce much to good administration to have a small minority in opposition in a County Council I do not know, but I think they would be just as well absent for all useful and beneficial

purposes. If I am right in that surely it is useless to take any whatever to secure the presence of a small minority in a County Council, and, therefore, I should be inclined to omit that portion of the Bill which deals with the cumulative vote altogether. But I think it would be necessary and a useful thing to have some Governing Body over the County Council to which an appeal might be made. I had an idea which I expressed in Belfast not long ago, and I think that no newspaper or shade of politics found any fault with that idea whatever. The idea was that, when elected, each County Council might themselves elect one member to a Central Body, which might be the Government Board, and which might be the Governing body of all the County Councils. That idea has been confirmed by a resolution passed by the Ulster Land Committee, a body composed of gentlemen of all shades of politics. I only rose to say one thing and that was that the expression in the newspapers which we have seen that there was likely to be any kneed support of the First Lord of the Treasury on this side of the House or any coolness towards the Members or their constituents, in my mind, entirely without foundation. (9.30.) MR. J. PINKERTON (way): Mr. Speaker, it is rather astonishing to hear a Protestant Member from the North of Ireland speaking in the tone of the hon. Member Rentoul.)

MR. RENTOUL: I did not speak in any disrespectful tone, or in any other tone, as to the minority simply tried to point out that when a body composed of 30 Members have two or three of a minority holding strongly different views from the rest of those two or three Members are likely to act as an irritant to the majority.

\*MR. PINKERTON: The hon. Gentleman must remember that a leaven is likely to leaven the whole lump. Possibly, a minority may have influence to a very great extent in the case of the majority. So far as my experience goes, in every part of the land the Protestants are treated

*Mr. James A. Rentoul*

exceptional kindness by the Catholics. It is only when you go north of the Boyne, and reach the City of Belfast, that you find intolerance displayed by law-abiding pillars of the Constitution. I am more opposed to the proposal of the seven Grand Jurors and the Sheriff than I am to that of the two Judges. In fact, all the business of every county is to be handed over to the seven Grand Jurors, giving a casting vote to the High Sheriff. Every hon. Member in this House must know the difference between the Scottish Sheriff and the High Sheriff in Ireland. The High Sheriffs in Ireland are selected by the Lord Lieutenant not for their ability, but owing to the fact that they can maintain and support a certain amount of pomp and circumstance to receive the Judge in a proper manner. If it is necessary to have some safeguard in Ireland, let us have a Central Council elected from all the County Councils in Ireland as a Court of Appeal. I fail to see why this matter should be left to the decision of the Grand Jurors or the Judges. In fact if you are to try the elective principle in the baronies, it should hold good in the counties and with regard to County Councils. I had no intention of interposing in this Debate, but as a Protestant from the north of Ireland said that the minority was of no account—

Mr. RENTOUL: I never said anything of the kind in my life. I simply said I think a minority on a council would be of no value.

\*Mr. PINKERTON: I am afraid that this explanation will not go down in the county of Down. (Laughter.) The electors of the county of Down hold a very different opinion. They regard themselves as a very important minority in Ireland. They regard the county Down as not only the most important county in Ireland, but as the top of creation. The Protestant minority in Down, in Antrim, and in the North of Ireland is certain to exercise a salutary influence in the interests of Ireland. I utter a most indignant protest against a so-called Orange Representative expressing such views to this House.

\*(9.37.) Mr. WEBB (Waterford, E.): Mr. Speaker: It must have been thought, I think, that during all

the long years of the past, during all the Coercion Acts, we were yet to hope for something quite different from the proposals of the Government. But now when we see them we find we are descending to a deeper depth than ever. I would like English Members, Liberal Members, to attentively regard the situation. The First Lord of the Treasury dwelt very strongly on the great chasms existing in Ireland. Why do these chasms exist? They exist purely and solely not in the nature of the people, but in the system by which you seek to govern Ireland. One party has been taught to live independent of the other. Public opinion has been scorned. If any party in any country is kept in rights which do not belong to it, or given property which it should not possess, so surely will chasms exist. Just in proportion as the working classes here have obtained power, just as their strength as trade unionists has increased, so classes here have been drawn together. I believe it will be so in Ireland. There is no real influence, I believe, so great as the healing influence of enjoying equal privileges. Now, I think you must either trust us wholly or not at all. Past oppression has formed a great wrong to Ireland, and it is quite right that now we should get a better chance of equality. Suppose the majority in Ireland were to act in a wrong or dishonest manner. You have had sufficient power in the past to deal with them. I quite admit that in the course of the readjustment of matters in the last two years things have not always gone so smoothly as they might have gone. We could not have expected otherwise. Irishmen are just as good as you are, and just as honest as you are, and I do not know why we should have any less liberty than you have. There was one vein of truth in the remark of the First Lord of the Treasury which I think should be noted. A great many people think that because resolutions might, under Home Rule, be passed against the power of England, that power might pass away. I think we have an admission in the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury that such a supposition is groundless. Reso-

lutions will have no effect whatever. I do not think we would be fit to enjoy British liberty if we did not object, in the strongest possible manner, against the passing of this Bill.

\* (9.40. MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I did not intend to intervene in this Debate, but some observations have fallen from the hon. Member who has just sat down which I would like to allude to. I wish to assure the House there is no distrust on the part of the Protestants of the North as to the question of Local Government in Ireland. The Belfast Conservative Association unanimously passed a resolution the other day approving of the scheme for Local Self-Government, and they did this before they had an opportunity of seeing the Bill that has been introduced to-night by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. They did it in the spirit that we in the North of Ireland feel—that it is extremely desirable there should be similarity of law to govern the three countries. (Hear, hear.) It is quite absurd for hon. Members on the other side of the House to talk about the tyranny that is exercised in Ireland over certain classes. The day of ascendancy has long gone by. There is no such thing as Protestant ascendancy in Ireland now. An hon. Member opposite (Mr. Sexton), said the other night that Roman Catholics were perfectly equal to the Protestants in Ireland on the question of education. We do not desire to see the ascendancy of class over class. We desire the most perfect equality, whatever shape the representation of the minority in local government is to take: I am not very careful or anxious to see that carried out. Further, I am not very much in love with this cumulative vote. We, in the North of Ireland, are perfectly able to take care of ourselves. I cannot say I quite agree with my hon. Friend the Member for East Down (Mr. Rentoul) with regard to the treatment of the minority. I do not know whether the effect of a minority may be irritating in the County Council of London. But a certain minority in the City of Derry long ago found it very desirable to enter a protest—an irritating

*Mr. Webb*

protest against the majority, and I carry their protest even further. I am sure my hon. Friend did not intend to depreciate the efforts of minorities in Ireland to safeguard their rights and liberties. I have to thank the First Lord of the Treasury for introducing this measure. We are perfectly prepared to give a hearty and cordial support to it. I desire to express, on the part of those I represent, that it is in no grudging or hesitating manner that we support the efforts to give to Ireland a measure of Local Self-Government.

(9.44.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Mr. Speaker, upon the question of the action about to be taken by the House at the present time, I unreservedly adopt the idea expressed by the Member for Derby (Sir W. Harcourt). I think it would be a great pity to place the slightest impediment in the way of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury bringing the Bill before the House and the country. There is a great difference of tone between the first and second speeches of the right hon. Gentleman. In his second speech I thought I discovered something like a note of defiance—a note of Dissolution, qualified, probably, only by the fear as to whether this Bill was a Bill on which they would dare to go before the country. At any rate, we may assume they regard this as a test of the opinion of the electors and I should be very sorry indeed if any impediment were successfully applied to deny to the House and the country an opportunity of seeing this measure. With that view I shall certainly not oppose the motion, and I should advise my Friend not to put the House to the trouble of a division. I have seen many Bills introduced—some that were irritating, others that were laughable; but never in all my experience have I seen a Bill upon which the brand of incompetence was so deeply set—a Bill which is at the same time contemptible and ridiculous. We can sympathise with the right hon. Gentleman, because the Land Purchase Bill of last year was very largely of his own devising. I think some of the safeguarding provisions in this Bill which the right hon. Gentleman expounded with anything but the zeal of

a parent to-night, must have been forced upon him by injudicious advisers; and if it were not to satisfy the Orange and Conservative body in Ireland that the right hon. Gentleman introduced the cumulative vote, I cannot imagine at whose instance this strange provision was introduced. It has been promised that Ireland should substantially have the same system of Local Self-Government as England, but there is no general principle in the English Local Government Act which is not traversed in this Bill. Irishmen are not to get the control of the police; they do not obtain the Parliamentary franchise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, you do.

MR. SEXTON: I mean the cumulative franchise. In England it was one man one vote, but in Ireland they would have *scrutin de liste*, than which there could be no worse principle for the election of local bodies. By the adoption of that system they would have a Party ticket in each section—Nationalists on the one hand and Conservatives on the other—and none but partisans would be elected. It was upon the promise that Ireland was to have such a Local Government Bill as England received that the Conservatives obtained power; but did any man of any school of politics pretend that this Bill would satisfy the desire of Irishmen for Home Rule?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

MR. SEXTON: What good will be served by the cumulative vote? It did not exist in England or Scotland. Why is this inequality—this cumbrous, perplexing provision—imposed in the case of Ireland? The right hon. Gentleman has said that the barony will be the unit of election.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is rather a difficult question. The barony is the unit for baronial elections, but for the county elections the units are certain electoral areas, which will be announced at the later stages of the Bill, but which are not coincident with the baronies.

MR. SEXTON: The county, then, is not the unit?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

MR. SEXTON: I submit that in Ulster the cumulative vote will have no other effect than that which would follow the Parliamentary vote. Outside Ulster, no doubt, in certain counties, the adoption of the *scrutin de liste* system might give the minority a hearing; but if the counties are divided into electoral areas the system will not give the minority a hearing, and therefore the minority will be injured by the cumulative vote. As regards the Standing Committees, it is absurd that, in respect to capital expenditure and new charges, they and not the County Council will have control. The Standing Committee is to be composed of 15 men, of whom seven are to be nominated by the Council and seven by the Grand Jury, with the Sheriff as the Chairman. Now, the Sheriff is to be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant; and therefore the Sheriff and seven of his men will go from the Grand Jury room to the County Council room, and the eight will out-vote the seven who represent the electors with respect to every new expenditure or capital charge. Now, Sir, I should like to say a word with regard to the question of the trial before two Judges. Positively at the end of the nineteenth century, with our advanced views of popular representation, it is seriously proposed that—for example, in a county like Cork—any 20, any gang of ill-conditioned, ill-tempered evicting landlords can form a conspiracy and hale before a Judge the elected representatives of the County of Cork. And upon what pretence? They need not be at a loss for a pretext; the right hon. Gentleman has given them a perfect rosary of them. They can charge a County Council with disobedience to the law, with corruption, or malversation, or oppression. Possibly a Judge of Assize may be bound in regard to the terms "corruption or malversation"; but in regard to the term "oppression," a very large

and high-coloured term, I can easily imagine a case where a learned Judge—and there are many learned Judges in Ireland—having a group of Unionist malcontents or a gang of evicting landlords before him, and having on the other side a County Council as unpopular with the Unionist classes as the London County Council. In such a case, and on such a charge as that of oppression, I can imagine what chance of escape the County Council would have. Does the First Lord of the Treasury think it is any answer to our objection that the County Council would be found “Not guilty?” Does he ignore our claims to equality in respect of our common manhood? In England and Scotland you start your schemes of Local Government upon the assumption that the men elected for public life will be honourable and honest; but in Ireland you start with the assumption that they will not be honest men, and that you must make them amenable to the public and the criminal tribunals. That is not reasonable. It is not fair. It is insulting to our people. The county cess in Ireland is paid by the occupier. The fraction which the landlords pay is infinitesimally small, and how can the House believe that the Irish people would encourage corruption or malversation in respect of those moneys which they contribute? In this matter you should leave the elected Representatives to their constituents; and if they act extravagantly or corruptly, they will go back to receive the judgment of their constituents. For my part, I can say that I will resist, and that I believe my friends will resist, to the very utmost of our power, all schemes to put our country under a disability which is founded on nothing else than your morbid, your eternal suspicion of everything that concerns Ireland, and your delusion that there is something superior about yourselves that requires your constant control, guidance, and checking influence to keep us from robbing ourselves. The drawing up of this Bill—if the time of the Government is of any value, which is somewhat doubtful—is a waste of their time, and it is certainly a waste of the time of the House to discuss such a measure.

*Mr. Sexton*

\*(10.10.) MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): The fact, Sir, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast advise, the House not to divide upon the Motion for the introduction of this Bill shows that we have got into calmer waters than was the case in the earlier part of the evening. I only interpose for a few minutes in order to express my views upon the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury and upon the remarks of the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast, who complained of the non-fulfilment of a promise made by the noble Lord the Member for Paddington when he was the Leader of this House, that in the matter of Local Government there should be similarity, simultaneity, and equality of treatment as between Ireland and the Sister Countries. As to simultaneity, the exigencies of time always made that impossible; and I have always thought the promise of equality was like the suggestion of one and the same pill for all diseases. The first fact of this Bill is that it effects a transfer of administrative functions from the Grand Juries in Ireland to the proposed County Councils; and on this head the hon. Member for West Belfast complains that the Bill is in no sense parallel with the English Act, because nothing is said about the police. But the hon. Gentleman must be aware that the Quarter Sessions in England had control of the police before ever the English Act was passed. The Grand Juries have never had control of the police in Ireland, and there could not be a transfer of that which they had not. Sir, I pass that entirely by. The real and serious objection that has been raised is as to the want of fulness in not transferring the power of Grand Juries to award compensation for malicious injuries. The hon. and learned Member for Longford dwelt very forcibly on the manner in which that power is at present exercised; and the possibility of its abuse is manifest; but the argument is a bad argument for a transfer to the County Councils, and I should have thought that the moral

was that it was improper to entrust judicial functions of that character to a multitudinous Public Body. It has been suggested that the power should be handed over to the County Court Judge, and all I would wish to say upon it is this: that the power is a most dangerous one, and one that has no doubt been abused by Grand Juries. Therefore you must deal with it in an independent way, and not entrust it to another multitudinous body, for that would only be to transfer and perpetuate the abuse. If we look to County Councils nearer home, in the exercise of such quasi-judicial functions as that of licensing, we see the extreme inconvenience of placing such functions in the hands of a multitudinous body. Such functions should, in my view, be entrusted to some limited body, who should be put upon their responsibility in the exercise of the power given them. Passing from the transfer of functions, there comes the question of the persons who are to exercise the franchise, and here, with one exception, there is no ground of complaint. The one exception is, of course, the disallowance of the facilities granted to illiterate voters. The common master of my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle and of myself—namely, John Stuart Mill—has laid it down that an educational qualification might be rightly insisted upon, and, in point of fact, it has been, and I believe is, insisted upon, in more than one of our Australian Colonies. Now, Sir, as regards another point—namely, the alteration in the mode of voting—the hon. Member for West Belfast said that instead of allaying, the alteration will promote, Party strife. I believe it will have just the opposite consequences, and that this method of election, which I have always advocated, will tend to dissipate and destroy Party strife. Let me point out that the system of one man one vote does not, at all events, destroy combination. Look at the London County Council, which has been conducted on the principle of one man one vote. Will you get rid of Party in the approaching contests for the election of members of that body? I read, this morning or yesterday, in the newspapers, a letter of some power written by the noble Lord the

Member for Barnsley (Earl Compton), in which he said he regretted that under the system of one man one vote, by which the London County Council was elected, a fatal obstacle was interposed to the running of independent men who would exercise a restraining influence upon extreme partisans. It is strange that those of us who desire to diminish Party organisation and Party method should advocate a mode of election which, according to the hon. Member for West Belfast, would increase then more. If you compare the results of the elections for the London School Boards with those of the London County Council, you will see that the London School Board, whatever may be its faults, at least contains an independent section which moderates the hostility of extreme Parties, and balances the one side against the other. That is what I understand the hon. Member for West Belfast to desire to attain in Ireland.

MR. SEXTON: Under the Bill, as it was described, no candidate would get his name upon a Party ticket except upon the ground of his being a politician.

\*MR. COURTNEY: The hon. Member speaks of *scrutin de liste*, but *scrutin de liste* differs entirely from the cumulative vote, under which electors may be allowed to choose between one man and another, as well as between one ticket and another. It is clear that the hon. Member does not appreciate the scheme of election. He said that in Ulster you get the Parties equally divided, but it is not the case that in the different counties of Ulster Parties are equally divided. Is it the case that in other districts of Ireland the Parties are equally divided. What is the case with the present mode of election in the City of Belfast? Although you have got a popular franchise in Belfast, the result is that in the Town Council you find men all of one way of thinking.

MR. SEXTON: Because it is 40 years since the city was divided into wards.

\*MR. COURTNEY: Still, it shows that the system of election by districts does not



secure the representation of all Parties, and that the plan proposed would not result in the dangers feared. It is perhaps very presumptuous for a mere Englishman to stand up for this system in Ireland when the hon. Member for Belfast and others object to it; but there is some reason, even with that concurrent condemnation, which makes me think the plan may be useful. It would secure in the north-eastern counties a Nationalist representation, and it will secure in the south-western counties the election of some Protestant representatives. The proposed method would certainly secure in the County Councils of Down and Antrim a representation of the Nationalists, whilst in Cavan and Monaghan it would secure the election of some Protestants. Look at Sligo, which the hon. Gentleman once represented.

MR. SEXTON: Sligo is an exceptional county.

\*MR. COURTNEY: It is very unfortunate that I can quote nothing but exceptional cases. But the hon. Gentleman does not appear to understand the operation and the force of the systems which even in Cork or Kerry would give representation to 1-14th or 1-15th of the electorate. Is it to be said that even in Cork or Kerry you cannot get 1-15th or 1-16th who belong to the other side? It is further to be remembered that minorities always develop when they have the means of growth, and you would find under this plan interests spring up where their existence was not at all suspected. The power to state the cases of the minority is all that is sought for. The fact that it is not the best method of securing this result is admitted by the First Lord of the Treasury himself. Incidentally the First Lord used a phrase, perhaps a little hastily chosen, by which he meant less good or less worthy. That reminds me, although it is quite irrelevant, that I should like to correct a misquotation of John Stuart Mill. Mr. Mill spoke not of the "stupid party" but of the "more stupid party." The plan proposed is one which those who have the well-being of Ireland at heart

*Mr. Courtney*

think a useful one. This method will not only secure the representation of a minority, which, however feeble, would be useful, but it secures the representation of the different sections of the majority. I often say to those friends with whom I act, more or less, that they mass together men who have many differences among themselves. There are different shades of Nationalists. There are some who would not accept anything less than the independence of Ireland — an Irish Republic. There are other Nationalists so moderate that they would be apparently content with the passing of something which would enable them to deal with the supply of gas and water. This scheme not only secures the representation of the Unionist Party, assuming them to be in the minority, but the different shades of opinion of the Nationalist Party. You might try to exclude these Nationalists whom you do not like, but you would find it impossible; and you would find every shade of the Nationalist Party represented—those who are more attached, those who are less attached to their clerical principles and clerical friends; those who are more keenly interested in agriculture; those who are more keenly interested in commerce; those, possibly, who, like the Member for Cork, are temperance partisans above all things; and those who, like the Member for the county of Cork, scout all teetotalers. Now, I do not suppose anybody will deny that the misery of Ireland is to be found in the strictly antagonistic nature of the relations between the different classes of Ireland. It will be allowed by those hon. Members who sit below the Gangway, as well by hon. Members on the other side, that it is a pity that the various classes should be so ignorant of one another, and I am afraid to say even hate one another. I do not say there is no justification for the feeling on the one side, or no explanation of the feeling on the other; but that is the nature of the Irish problem, and surely it will be something towards a solution if you could invent a method which should bring together, in the consideration, discussion, and discharge of local functions, representatives of all classes within the

counties. The mere fact that we bring together into this House representatives of the two Parties in Ireland makes those Parties better understand each other; and if in a year or two after, they leave this House, better understanding some of the conditions of the problem which they may not so fully have understood when they entered it, so I anticipate for the representatives of the different classes on the County Councils a better understanding of each other and of the problems with which they have to deal. Just as in the case of Members of this House there takes place a gradual transformation of view, an alteration of attitude, a relaxation from the painful tension that sometimes prevails while in the House, so would it be in the new gatherings of representatives of the different classes in the county. If they could associate together in the discharge of Irish local affairs, the people who are admitted to be so diverse at present, so strongly at daggers drawn, something would be done to draw them more towards each other to a better understanding, and, such is human nature, that I indulge the hope that you would bring them even to like one another. We are going through that experience in some of the English counties even now. We have in England the classes who have been called the privileged classes, and we have the unprivileged classes; and we have brought them together in the County Parliaments. I have never looked on these County Parliaments as things that were likely to do very much in the way of economy, of which I should like to see more; but I have always advocated them as breaking down the lines of demarcation between classes in England; and making the classes know one another better. I am glad to see that process going on; and I look to this system, in whatever form it is embodied, as a method of making the future of Ireland more hopeful, because it will make the people of Ireland understand the virtues as well as the faults of one another better than they do. Well, there is only one other point to which I would refer. It is the proposal to arraign a County Council before the Judges. I understand the

First Lord of the Treasury to refer to that as a power which would not be likely to be exercised. I think he almost hinted that it would never occur, that he did not anticipate it—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear.

\*MR. COURTNEY: I know that he did not anticipate the condition under which it would be necessary to call that power into operation, and I should suspect that the introduction of that provision was due rather to a desire to allay the anxieties which we know to exist— anxieties which are generally overstrained regarding the fear that the power of the majority might be abused. My own impression is that possibly that proposal will reach its fate in an intimation on the part of the Judges themselves that they do not like to accept such functions. (Hear, hear!) My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) says "hear, hear." He is entirely entitled to cry "hear, hear;" but the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), who sits by him, knows that he and I were in the position of having been Members of a Government which introduced a Bill which threw on Judges duties which they would not exercise, and that Act was in that respect a dead letter in consequence. If this proposal meets with the same fate, I confess I, for my part, shall not be the least sorry, and an intimation may well come beforehand, which may induce the Government not to persevere with it, because the Judges would not desire to have those functions imposed upon them. I would point out, also, that the true method, as it seems to me, of keeping a County Council in order is already to be found in the powers which the Courts of Law possess. If a County Council proceeds to act *ultra vires*, you can restrain their action; you can nullify what they have determined to do. If they are not acting *ultra vires*, then the proper remedy is to be found in the action of the electorate. But if you strictly define in your Bill what their powers are to be, then the abuse of their powers is limited; they cannot go beyond them. The moment they go into what they are not by the Act authorised to

do, they are subject to the jurisdiction of the Law Courts, and their action can be brought to nought by the ordinary processes which the Law Courts have opened to all. I have said more than I intended to have said when I got up; but before I sit down, I would also remind the House of the particularly sagacious principle my friend Mr. Fawcett often laid down among those who knew him—

"Never speak on the First Reading of a Bill; never condemn or praise strongly on the First Reading of a Bill; you never may know precisely what its real purport is; and you certainly never know what it will become."

I think that very judicious counsel, and older Members in this House are generally in the habit of receiving Bills with only some moderate inquiry, without flying into declarations that the thing is not to be entertained or listened to. I remember how the Land Bill of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Balfour) was received by my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian (Mr. Gladstone) when it was first brought in. My right hon. Friend made a very moderate speech on that occasion, and, acting on his advice, the House allowed it to be read a first time before 7 o'clock. He is an old Parliamentary hand—(laughter)—and I think it was a very judicious course to pursue. I apologise to the House not only for having occupied it so long, but also for having broken that example to which I have referred.

\*(10.40.) Mr. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): Although this Bill has only been under discussion for a few hours, and is not yet printed, I venture to think that we have had marked indications not from the Opposition, but from the supporters of the Government, of what the Bill is likely to become. It is perfectly obvious, from the right hon. Member for Bodmin, as well as the hon. Members for Down and Belfast, that we are likely to have in this Bill two Jonah clauses. The hon. Members for Down and Belfast joined in the denunciation of cumulative voting; and the right hon. Member for Bodmin anticipated that when the

Judges were asked to undertake the powers which this Bill seeks to confer on them, they will respectfully decline to undertake them. That does not look as if the prospects of the Bill are very favourable, and the tone and spirit in which it was brought forward do not look very hopeful. It is also doubtful to whom to ascribe the paternity of the Bill, as the First Lord of the Treasury did not seem very fond of the child he has taken charge of. The hon. Member for West Birmingham and the two hon. Gentlemen representing Ulster disclaimed any knowledge of the contents of the Bill. The right hon. Member for Bodmin has been, and is now, a consistent advocate of proportional representation, but I was not aware that he was prepared to support the precise system in vogue at School Board elections, and which the Government intend to apply to Irish County Council elections. There is a positive confusion of areas created by the Bill, as well as the very complex system of election which, in the only instance in which it has been tried in practice, has been found cumbrous and inoperative to some extent. The right hon. Gentleman admits that in this Bill he has introduced an altogether novel principle, and hon. Members have tried to quote precedents in support of the submission, and in certain cases the suppression, of the County Councils by the judicial authority, but none of them bear on the precise proposal of the Government. The position is this: Into this Bill, which professes to deal with Ireland more or less on the same terms as England, you have introduced a principle which you have not sought to embody in the English or Scotch Acts, and you introduce it in a form which affixes a severe stigma on the majority of the people of Ireland, and lays them open to suspicions of the gravest nature. That is not the way you would expect a Bill of this sort to be brought in, and I do not think there is a great chance of such a proposal being carried even if the Government

*Mr. Courtney*

intend to press the Bill forward, though from the tone of the First Lord of the Treasury it did not appear that their intentions are very serious. Consideration of the nature of the proposals made by the Bill, and the insults which, by implication, it makes against the people of Ireland would strongly lead me to join my friends in taking a Division against it, but I am influenced on the other side by two reasons: One, suggested by the hon. Member for Derby, that if the vote against the Bill were successful it would not be printed, and people would have no chance of knowing the exact nature of its provisions, and it is desirable that candidates for County Councils in England should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion as to their position and feelings if a provision were introduced in England to subject the County Council of, say London, to the jurisdiction of two Judges, who would have power to suppress it, it being competent for the Lord Lieutenant of the county to fill the vacancies. The proposal would appeal with irresistible force to the hearer's sense of the ludicrous. The other reason which influences me in not voting against the Bill is that, great as are its imperfections, and ludicrous and absurd as are some of its provisions, by this Bill you admit that it is possible to frame safeguards which, in your opinion, will be sufficient to protect the minority. It is perfectly obvious that if that can be done in regard to County Councils it can be done in regard to a Legislature sitting in Dublin. In some cases the Councils would be sitting in remote places where public opinion would have comparatively little force, but the Legislature sitting at Dublin would be sitting in the full light of public opinion and criticism. Therefore, however absurd the provisions of the Bill, in it the Government have taken a step in advance from which it is impossible to recede, an important step in advance in regard to the self-government of Ireland.

(10.50.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): There has been one good point in the Debate; it has produced an excellent lecture on proportional repre-

sentation by the right hon. Gentleman. I am not strongly in favour of cumulative voting, but I think there is much in favour of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, and I believe there is scarcely a county in Ireland in which the minority would not get one representative out of 15, though if Members in England are so fond of it they should try it at some of the English County Council elections. There is one good point in the Bill, the electorate, which is practically household suffrage with women thrown in. I have no objection to the introduction of Peers, as I do not think they would much affect the result of the elections. There was one point on which the First Lord of the Treasury was not so lucid as on the other points. I understood that illiterate voters were not to be allowed to vote at all; but the hon. Member for South Tyrone declared that he was of a wholly different opinion, and that the proposal was that they should not receive peculiar assistance in voting. Was the hon. Member correct?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is so.

COLONEL NOLAN: I have no objection; but if they had been disfranchised altogether, it would have been a terrible injustice. The Bill itself is altogether overweighted. I do not say it cannot possibly pass, and the English and Scotch votes; may bear down the Irish votes, but it never can be received in Ireland, because the transference of power is not sufficient, and, on the other hand, the cost of the new system will be greater than that of the present system. The Grand Jury system is about the worst you can have, but, on the whole, it is economical. They give appointments to their own friends; but so would the new County Councils. You will have, however, the cost of holding these elections, and the Councils will be more inclined to spend money in different districts in order to provide work. The transference of the sanitary business will also lead to expense. Under the Guardians the Medical Officer of Health and the Sanitary Officer held dual appointments, and were consequently less

expensive, as they were paid less for each post than if they held only one. I think the people would like County Councils in Ireland; but they would like them to have a certain amount of power. They know they will not get better roads and bridges, and it is not sufficient attraction that future appointments of officials will be in their hands instead of in the hands of the Grand Jury. The right hon. Gentleman has so filled the Bill with checks and safeguards that he has left no power to County Councils; the only power he has left them is power over the roads and bridges. The Bill brought in for land purchase in Ireland last year was also surrounded with checks and safeguards, and it has proved a failure. Under the right hon. Gentleman's measure really no transfer of power takes place. It will, at the same time, be more expensive, and I believe the people of Ireland will be united in the determination to wait for something better. I should be glad to adopt County Councils. I think County Councils must come. I brought in a Bill 15 or 16 years ago exactly on the same principle, and I am glad to see that the principle is now acknowledged. When I heard the proposal to give to two Judges the power to try County Councils I gave up the Bill altogether. The introduction of it is too utterly absurd, and cannot be listened to. I could not attempt to discuss the Bill from that point of view. If it is printed in the Bill it will be struck out at the earliest possible moment. I do not think the Bill will be accepted in Ireland, for it will not be an economic measure, and, therefore, I believe the best thing we can do is to put it off; for it will not pass this Session until we get a Home Rule Parliament, which will delegate certain portions of its powers to the County Councils.

(11.5.) MR. R. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): The thing struck me with surprise during the lecture of the right hon. Member for Liskeard, upon his favourite hobby of proportional representation, that he had not provided himself with a black board and a letter chalk. The right hon. Gentleman has ridden his hobby

*Colonel Nolan*

to such a length that I am inclined to say it is just now almost broken-winded. As to that portion of it in which the right hon. Gentleman referred to the visit to Donegal, I can only conclude that the Member for Bodmin must have fallen in amongst some of Cook's tourists. A most remarkable illustration was his reference to the Australian Colonies. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman does not wish to compare the Irish to the Sandwich Islanders and the Chinese; but I think the illustration was singularly infelicitous. I listened very carefully to the First Lord of the Treasury when he was introducing this measure. I hope, chiefly from the position I occupy, and from the fact that I am divorced from either Party in this House, that we shall see a more democratic cast of Bill introduced. I listened very carefully for anything that might seem like a ray of hope; and although I belong to those who give more attention and consideration to English than to Irish problems, I must say the Bill is so defective that you have turned me into as strong and severe an opponent of it as are the Irish Members themselves. I can imagine the feelings of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne when he was apostrophised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham upon democratic principles. He is, we know, opposed to every democratic measure, is an advocate of nationalisation, a strong advocate of Monarchy and for Royal grants, and will be, until pressure is introduced in Newcastle-on-Tyne to change his opinions. I can imagine his feelings when the expressions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham came home to him. It has been said that by the establishing of these County Councils you would gradually do away with class hatred, and soften down the lines of demarcation between the classes in the country. I believe that the introduction of these elective representatives of the different classes in this country will do more to increase class hatreds, and I would ask in which of the County Councils in England have these class hatreds been allayed? Only through class warfare are real reforms

accomplished, and I say that prophecy of the right hon. Gentleman in this regard is as illusory as the hopes he raises in reference to proportional representation. If by means of these County Councils class hatreds would be modified in Ireland, surely the same argument would apply much more strongly to a Home Rule Parliament. I am not here for the purpose of moderating class hatred, but rather for the sake of exciting it. It seems likely that not only in Ireland, but in England and Scotland, this Bill will communicate a good deal more passion than the First Lord of the Treasury appears to have anticipated. Though I look with considerable distrust upon the case coming from the Front Opposition Benches, still, after what I have heard from the First Lord of the Treasury, and after having tried to discover any democratic feeling whatever, or any concession to the rising democratic feeling in the country, I am bound to assure the right hon. Gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I will also have to offer my hearty opposition to this measure.

(11.17.) MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): I believe that the measure now before the House and offered by the First Lord of the Treasury to Ireland will be regarded by the vast majority of the Irish people as about the most studied insult of all the long insults that have been levelled at our people, and which have distinguished the right hon. Gentleman's tenure of office since he unfortunately became connected with the affairs of our country. The Bill of the First Lord may be regarded as a sort of death-bed repentance on the part of the Government. For the last six years the right hon. Gentleman and his friends have been engaged in coercing, insulting, and trampling upon the Irish people in every possible direction; and now when they know that they are at the end of their term of office, and when they know that they must appeal to the country, they make a futile attempt to change their policy, because they are afraid to go and appeal to the electors

of Great Britain upon a policy of coercion only for the people of Ireland. I am bound to say that if the Government now in power, or any other Government, had offered a legitimate and genuine measure of Local Government for Ireland, I would not have seen any reason why that measure should not have been accepted for the purpose of strengthening the demand of the Irish people for a native Legislature. But the measure offered by the right hon. Gentleman and his friends is not on the same lines as the measure given to Scotland and England; and I say it is absolutely insulting to the Irish people to ask them to accept even in a matter of Local Government something less than you have given to the Scotch and English people. If you are not able to trust the Irish people to conduct themselves as a civilised people, why do you go through the mockery of giving Local Government, pretending to give them Local Government at all? I say it is an absurd thing to endeavour to coerce the people with one hand and to give them Local Government with the other. If they are entitled to Local Government they ought not to be coerced; and if you are going to coerce them it is simply a piece of absurd inconsistency to imagine you can do any good by giving Local Government to them. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of safeguards which he proposed to introduce in the Bill for the purpose of protecting minorities in Ireland. I say it is an unreasonable thing to suppose for a moment that there is any disposition on the part of the majority of the Irish people to oppress the minority of their fellow-countrymen. I say there is no ground whatever for any such assumption. In this House Catholic constituencies have got Protestant Representatives, and Protestant constituencies have got Catholic Representatives; and I say that if County Councils were set up in Ireland in all cases where there was a Protestant, or what is called a loyalist, minority they would have a full and fair representation, such as their numbers entitled them to have; and, therefore, the safeguards of the right hon. Gentleman are absurd in the very last degree. With regard to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman to give the

Judges the power of controlling the County Councils, I can only say that it is on a par with all the other proposals of the right hon. Gentleman in connection with Ireland. My own personal opinion is that if the provision with regard to the Judges in this Bill becomes law that you will find it extremely difficult to get even as many as half-a-dozen men in Ireland willing to become County Councillors, holding themselves liable to be put in the dock at any moment, and put in prison by partisan Judges appointed by Dublin Castle. The right hon. Gentleman has never yet taken my advice; but if the right hon. Gentleman will take my advice on this occasion, he will find that my advice will save him a very great deal of useless trouble and labour. My advice to him is not to have this Bill printed at all, not to go a single step further with it; but if he has it in manuscript to send for the very largest waste paper basket in the House, and have it deposited there and sent away, and let us hear nothing more about it. If the right hon. Gentleman perseveres with this Bill he will find the strongest possible opposition from every section of the Irish Representatives. Out of 103 Members representing Ireland, can he count half-a-dozen who are cordially in favour of this Bill? It is a notorious fact in Ireland that the Conservatives in Ireland have no desire whatever for this Bill. I, for my part, do not believe that any measure of Local Government, whether this measure, which is a sham, or any other measure of Local Government, will have the effect anticipated apparently in some quarters of quieting and settling the Irish people down. I do not see any use in disguising the fact. My opinion is—and I believe it is the opinion of many Members of this House, I know it is the opinion of Members from Ireland—that if you do set up County Councils in Ireland with the view of satisfying the Irish people you will very soon find out that we will use these County Councils for the purpose of strengthening our political position, and for the purpose of gaining increased political power to press forward our demand for national self-government. We do not want any mockeries or

*Mr. William Redmond*

any shams, either local or National, in Ireland; and the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised, as I said before, if he dropped the Bill at once. He would save the House a great deal of trouble, and himself and his Government a great deal of humiliation, which undoubtedly will overtake them if he presses this measure forward against the will of the people of Ireland. With regard to the North of Ireland, I do not believe there is any particular desire, even among the Conservatives of the North of Ireland, for a Bill of this kind. The constituency which I represent at the present time is a constituency in which there are very many thousands of voters who are Conservative and Protestant; and I believe that even these voters have put forward no demand for a Bill of this kind, and they do not desire the Government to go on with this measure; and, under these circumstances, I think the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury ought really to say whether the Government having made a mistake will re-consider their position. Unless we get some assurance to-night that this Bill will be dropped, unless we get some more satisfactory statement than that of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, this Debate will go on until tomorrow, and possibly until next week. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord has spoken twice on this subject; but it is not too much to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say whether the Government now, after to-night's Debate, are in exactly the same position with regard to this measure as they were when the First Lord introduced it this afternoon. If the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland has not spoken, I think I may appeal to him with confidence to say whether I am not right in declaring that there is really no desire in Ireland for this Bill. He knows perfectly well that I am within the truth in saying there is no demand for it amongst the Nationalists of Ireland; and if that be so, if Ireland rejects and repudiates the Bill, surely it is not unreasonable to ask that you should drop the measure, or that if you persist in going on with it you

declare to-night, before the  
does any further, whether you  
modify it in any degree or  
think it would facilitate matters  
the hon. Gentleman the First  
distinctly stated what is his  
regard to the large body of  
voters. I certainly under-  
stand to say that the illiterate  
could be excluded from voting  
members of the County Council.  
not be assumed that a man  
common sense and intelligence  
he happens to be unable to  
write. In our country, as in  
Ireland, there are large numbers  
who are illiterate and yet are  
able of exercising the franchise,  
and much entitled to exercise the  
as the hon. Member for South  
or any of the distinguished  
in whom I see opposite. I do  
the hon. Member (Mr. John-  
ston) in wishing to exclude  
voters, for many of his friends  
worth would be excluded.

JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): If  
the Member will pardon me for  
saying him, what I complain of is,  
it should be some who say they  
cannot read and yet can read and

REDMOND: I, for one, am  
opposed to the exclusion of  
voters, for I say some of  
intelligent people are illite-  
rate—the simple reason that in  
your Government made the  
of our poorer classes almost  
illiterate. I do not know any-  
thing so irritating to an Irishman  
as to hear sneers and jeers at the  
people for being illiterate, know-  
ing, that illiteracy is simply  
difficulties put in the way of  
the people, though education  
carried on in spite of these  
difficulties. I am opposed to  
the passing of this Bill. I think we  
have a clear statement from a  
member of the Government whether  
or not we have had this evening  
any way altered their intentions  
regarding the Bill. It concerns us  
to know this, for if the

Government intend going on with  
the Bill as it is we shall have to  
make arrangements for offering every  
opposition to it. Let the Chancellor  
of the Exchequer tell us if the Govern-  
ment really intend to proceed with the  
Bill, and if so, when he proposes to  
take the Second Reading. Let him  
tell us if the Government have any  
disposition to make modifications in the  
proposals. The Attorney-General for  
Ireland has not addressed the House  
yet; let him, if he can, contradict me  
when I say that among the Con-  
servatives in Ireland there is no desire  
for this Bill, while it is repudiated by  
the Nationalists. Will it, then, be  
pressed forward? Unless we have  
some intimation of what the Govern-  
ment propose to do, this Debate will  
probably be continued into next  
week.

(11.45.) Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr.  
Balfour, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ritchie, and  
Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Bill presented, and read first time.  
[Bill 174.]

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Will  
the right hon. Gentlemen say when the  
Bill will be circulated?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope early  
next week.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

### MILBANK PRISON BILL—(No. 140.)

#### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.48.) THE SECRETARY TO THE  
TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chat-  
ham): I do not think there will be any  
opposition to this Bill, the object of  
which is to vest the site of Millbank  
Prison in the Commissioners of Works.  
Millbank Prison was built in the last  
century, and the land has been held by  
the Crown for the purposes of a prison,  
and now that it has been determined  
that the prison is no longer required,  
the Crown has no power to part  
with it without the authority of Parlia-  
ment. As all other Crown lands are



under the control of the Commissioners of Works, we proceed by the simple expedient of vesting this also in the Commissioners. The Bill is a very short one, and needs, I think, no further explanation. Under the "Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1885," it is provided that such sites may be sold to the Metropolitan Board of Works—the then authority in such matters—for the housing of the working classes. That provision is still unrepealed, and therefore the Crown is still under the moral obligation to let the County Council have the refusal of the site at a fair market price.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

(11.53.) MR. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.): I am not going to oppose the Second Reading of this Bill, but as it will be in the recollection of the House that I took an active part in opposition to a proposal for dealing with another prison site, I should like it to be clearly understood that in talking of a fair market price to be given for the land for the purpose of erecting houses for the working classes, there is no idea of proceeding in the manner adopted with the Coldbath Prison site—the ridiculous plan of asking so much per prison cell for the site now used for Post Office purposes. I shall be glad to know that nothing of the kind will prevent the land being used for housing the working classes.

(11.54.) SIR JOHN GORST: This Bill, if passed into law, will not in any way hamper the Government in offering the site to the County Council. The land will be sold in the ordinary way at so much per acre, the only provision is for a fair market price by which it is intended that the country in general should not be made to pay for improvements in the Metropolis. The taxpayers of the whole of the United Kingdom have an interest in this, and hence it is that the County Council of London, should the Council desire to acquire the land, must do so at a fair market price.

*Sir John Gorst*

(11.55.) MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): I do not know whether the Government are anxious to have the Bill passed to-night, but if there is no hurry, I think it would not be unreasonable to ask that it should be postponed until it can be taken at an earlier hour than this.

MR. R. G. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.): The site at the present time is entirely unused. The Bill may be for the benefit of the working classes of London, and I must say I think it ill becomes an Irish Member to offer opposition to it.

(11.56.) MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): I would appeal to the hon. Member to allow the Second Reading of the Bill now, in order that the County Council may have the matter to deal with without delay.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday.

#### INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES (LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT) BILL.—(No. 114.)

##### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.57.) MR. SEALE - HAYNI (Devon, Ashburton): It is obvious that at this late hour I cannot go into full explanation of the provisions of this Bill. It is a Bill in which Industrial and Co-operative Societies take the greatest possible interest, and it is founded on the unanimous recommendation of the Town Holdings Committee. It proposes to give power for the enfranchisement of leaseholders in accordance with the Report of the Committee, and I sincerely trust that inasmuch as the Bill is supported by hon. Members on both sides of the House, and arouses no party question the House will now permit the Bill to be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Seale-Hayne.*)

(11.59.) MR. AMBROSE (Middlesex Harrow): The Bill, the Second Reading of which the hon. and learned Gen

tleman has just proposed, involves a very important principle. The question of giving to industrial and provident societies facilities for acquiring the property they hold, or lease, is one thing, and I am quite prepared to do anything to assist the development of these societies, provided always—

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Tuesday next.

**SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 112.)**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

(12.0.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): This Bill passed a Second Reading unanimously last year, though afterwards its progress was interrupted by hon. Members who represented the views of some owners of Irish fisheries who believed their interests were threatened. I have communicated with my hon. Friend the Member for St. Helen's (Mr. Seton-Karr), and he on the part of fishery owners has consented to the Second Reading, provided that the Bill is afterwards referred to a Select Committee. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland will consent to this course being adopted. The questions which are raised are somewhat technical and important enough to have the consideration of a Committee upstairs when the owners of fisheries claim they have a right to have their case heard. I believe the objections they urge are of such a technical nature that they could not, with advantage, be debated in the House. It is morally certain that Debate would simply take the form of statements on one side and contradiction on the other. I think a Select Committee, with evidence before them, will arrive at a just and fair conclusion on a matter of considerable importance both to the fishery owners and the milling industries throughout Ireland. Mill-owners have substantial reasons

for complaint, and the first clause is designed to remedy a grievance imposed by the Act of 1879. When that Act was passed it was said that the only object was to transfer jurisdiction from the Commissioners of Fisheries; but beyond that the Act takes away from mill-owners in Ireland a protection mill-owners in this country enjoy. This is one of the grievances the Bill is intended to remove, and which mill-owners are prepared to submit with the claims of the fishery owners to the judgment of a Select Committee. The remaining clauses of the Bill are taken from the English Salmon Fisheries Act, and simply confer on mill-owners in Ireland the same protection mill-owners in England enjoy. If it can be proved in evidence before the Committee that this protection is excessive, then those I represent are quite ready to abide by the decision. I have said this matter is of great importance to the milling industries in Ireland. There is in Antrim one tributary of the Bann upon which there are no less than 25 mills, all affected by the action of the Conservators of Fisheries on the Bann. I trust the House will, on the understanding that it shall be sent to a Select Committee, give the Bill a Second Reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Macartney.*)

(12.5.) MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's): Last Session I was one of those who were successful in the attempt to prevent the passing of the Bill in the small hours of the morning; and I may say now that I am entirely at issue with my hon. Friend on all the facts and the merits of the Bill. I represent a strong opposition to the Bill, not only in Lancashire, but in the West of Ireland, from fishing interests there. I have had a consultation with my hon. Friend, and those whom I represent desire that the facts upon which we are at issue with the promoters of the Bill should be most carefully examined before a Select Committee. I quite agree that

the issue being upon facts, a Select Committee is the best tribunal for threshing out the merits of the Bill. We are, as a matter of fact, prepared to show that the Bill is not required to meet the justice of the case, and I trust the Government may see their way to consent to the appointment of the Committee, and perhaps I may be permitted to say at this stage that in the composition of the Committee the Unionist Party should not be too strongly represented. We are prepared to prove that evidence of the Inspectors of Fisheries is entirely against the Bill in its present form, and I trust that the Second Reading if taken will be only on the understanding that the Bill shall go before a Select Committee.

(12.8.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am bound to say I have made inquiries from the Inspectors of Fisheries and it is right to say that they see great objections to the Bill as it stands at present. They inform me that a question arising as to one river is the cause of the Bill. (Mr. McCARTHY: No, no.) I should be sorry to assist in passing a Bill which would do anything to diminish the value of salmon fishing in Ireland, upon which great expenditure has been incurred in the past. At the same time I quite understand it is possible there may be cases in the North of Ireland where manufacturing interests, also important, require that arrangements should be made, which, while preserving the salmon fishing, and providing that it shall be in no way injured, may secure to mill-owners those rights of water which are so valuable to their industry. I feel constrained to offer no opposition to the Second Reading now, on the distinct understanding that the inquiry before a Select Committee shall be very complete, and where it will be the duty of Inspectors of Fisheries to state their case.

(12.11.) MR. M. HEALY (Cork): It is proposed to refer the Bill to a

*Mr. Seton-Karr*

Select Committee, but the terms reference have not been put down. It is a mere reference without a statement as to sending for persons, papers and records.

MR. SPEAKER: That follows the Motion for the nomination of Committee.

(12.11.) MR. M. KENNY (Tyndal Mid): Before we submit this mischievous and uncalled for Bill to Select Committee, it is well we should know how this Committee is constituted. A fair arrangement should be made for the nominations. I think it is premature to take the Second Reading to-night, and I would advise the hon. Member in charge of the Bill to first look about and see what arrangements he can make through the aid of the respective Parties. Unless this is done, I must object to progress being made with the Bill. I do not intend to discuss the merits of the Bill at this hour, but I am convinced that the proposals are most mischievous from many points of view. It will result of no benefit to mill-owners, some of whom are most anxious for the Bill, indeed, it will do some of them more injury than good. I shall, so far as I can, oppose the Bill through the Committee.

(12.14.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway N.): I must protest against a pernicious habit which is growing up of moving the Second Reading of a Bill, and asking who supports and who opposes it, without anything upon the merits of the Bill itself. Now, I have rapidly gone through the Bill, and I can tell the House more about it than the hon. Member has told us in moving the Second Reading. It provides gratings being fixed to prevent salmon being drawn up by mill wheels, and should think a proper provision should be made to control the action of conservators in stopping up streams for the benefit of the salmon. Now, the conservators of rivers in Ireland are a ridiculous body. Anybody who pays £2 can be a conservator, and

to anything unless there is an appointment to be made. A few Boards of Conservators are better; but, generally speaking, you might, in half an hour, collect in the Strand a body of men who would do the work as well as these conservators. I think the hon. Member might have given us some explanation of his Bill; but, however, if it is sent to a Select Committee probably some good will result.

(12.16.) DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): I sympathise with my hon. and gallant Friend in the desire to know something of a Bill we are asked to read a second time; but it should be said that last Session we did have a full exposition of the provisions of the Bill from the hon. Member opposite. But I rise to make an appeal to my hon. Friend (Mr. Kenny) to allow the Bill to go forward. I have received a number of representations which induces me to think there is every reason why the Bill should be threshed out before a Committee. If I have any influence with my hon. Friend I would appeal to him to allow the Bill to be read a second time.

MR. M. KENNY: I object.

(12.17.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): Perhaps I may be allowed to explain that I have followed the ordinary course, and I am quite ready to adopt the usual course for securing on the Committee the representation of all sections in the House.

(12.17.) MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): I may explain to the hon. Member that it is impossible to nominate a Committee until a Bill is read a second time. If the Second Reading is taken now, the hon. Member will be equally master of the situation, because the Motion for the appointment of Members of the Committee if opposed cannot come on after midnight.

MR. M. KENNY: Under the circumstances I withdraw my objection.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee.

# MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 34.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

# LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 39.)

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [17th February] further adjourned till to-morrow.

# CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 110.)

Read the third time, and passed.

# PLACES OF WORSHIP (SITES) BILL. (No. 135.)

Second Reading deferred from Tuesday next till Friday 11th March.

## MOTIONS.

### LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Rathbone, Bill to establish Limited Partnerships, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Rathbone, Sir Horace Davey, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Lewis Fry, Sir William Houldsworth, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Bryce.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 175.]

### WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Haldane, Bill to remove the disabilities of Women, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Haldane, Sir Edward Grey, and Mr. Thomas Ellis.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 176.]

### SMALL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Haldane, Bill to facilitate the creation of Small Holdings and Allotments in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Esslemont, Mr. Robert Reid, and Mr. Munro Ferguson.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 177.]

### LEASEHOLDERS (PURCHASE OF FEE SIMPLE) BILL.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 177.]

PARCEL POST (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND GREAT BRITAIN).

Return presented,—relative thereto [ordered 11th February; Mr. Henniker Heaton]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE No. 11).

Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations for Degrees in Arts (Ordinance No. 11, General No. 6) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

(No. 12).—Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations for Degrees in Science (Ordinance No. 12, General No. 7) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

(No. 13).—Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations as to Examinations (Ordinance No. 13, General No. 8) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

(No. 14).—Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations for Degrees in Medicine (Ordinance No. 14, Glasgow No. 1 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

(No. 15).—Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations for Degrees in Medicine (Ordinance No. 15, Aberdeen No. 1) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

(No. 16).—Copy presented,—of Ordinance made by the Scottish Universities Commissioners with regard to the Regulations for Degrees in Medicine (Ordinance No. 16, Edinburgh No. 1) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented,—of Order made by the Secretary of State for the discontinuance of Nottingham Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHTHOUSES ABROAD.

Account presented,—showing the dues received and expenditure incurred

in the construction, repair, and tenance of Lighthouses in British Sessions Abroad during the year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GLEBE LANDS (SALES)

Return ordered—

“Showing the Sales of Glebes continuation of Parliamentary Paper, N. Session 1891.”—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

CIVIL SERVICES AND RE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1891-2).

Supplementary Estimate presents Sums required to be voted for the year ending 31st March, 1892, in addition to the Sums already provided in the Estimate presented in the current year [by Committee of Supply]; to be printed. [No. 53.]

EASTBOURNE IMPROVEMENT ACT, 1885 (PROSECUTIONS FOR VIOLATIONS OF AIR SERVICES, &c.)

Address for—

“Return showing (1) the number and particulars of the charges brought, from the 1st day of June, 1891, to the 18th February, 1892, before the Justices of the Peace at Eastbourne, for offences under the Eastbourne Improvement Act, 1885, otherwise committed by persons taking part in open air services or meetings, or processions, or on the police in connection therewith, or for breaches of the peace, or for damaging property, or threatening, or insulting, or resisting the police in connection therewith; and (2) the number and particulars of the charges brought before the said Justices during the same period for assaults on persons, or for taking part in such services, or meetings, or processions, or on the police in connection therewith, or for breaches of the peace, or for damaging property, or threatening, or insulting, or resisting the police in connection therewith; and (3) the results in such cases, with the particulars of any fines awarded, of other proceedings, if any, in consequence of conviction, and of any term of imprisonment actually served.” (*Rowntree.*)

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 19th February, 1892.

## INDIAN COUNCILS ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]—(No. 3)

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3<sup>a</sup> on Monday next.

## COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have (in pursuance of Standing Order No. L.) nominated the following Lords to serve as Chairmen of Standing Committees:

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| R. Chancellor. | E. Camperdown.    |
| L. Cadogan.    | (L. E. Kimberley. |
| Privy Seal.)   | L. Monk Bretton.  |
| R. Derby.      | L. Herschell.     |
| R. Belmore.    | L. Basing.        |
| R. Morley.     |                   |

And that the Committee have (in pursuance of Standing Order No. XLVI.) nominated the following Lords to serve on the Standing Committee appointed on Thursday last:

|                           |                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| L. Archbp. of Canterbury. | E. Brownlow.            |
| L. Chancellor.            | E. Morley.              |
| L. Archbp. of York.       | E. Camperdown.          |
| V. Cranbrook.             | (L. E. Yarborough.      |
| President.)               | E. Dudley               |
| R. Cadogan.               | (L. E. Kimberley.       |
| Privy Seal.)              | E. Ravensworth.         |
| D. Saint Albans.          | E. Wharnccliffe.        |
| D. Devonshire.            | E. Northbrook.          |
| D. Rutland.               | E. Selborne.            |
| M. Salisbury.             | L. Bramwell.            |
| M. Bath.                  | L. Monk Bretton.        |
| M. Abercorn.              | (D. L. de Vesci. (V. de |
| Abercorn.)                | Vesci.)                 |
| M. Ripon.                 | L. Northington. (L.     |
| R. Mount-Edgcumbe.        | Henley.)                |
| (L. Steward.)             | L. Rothschild.          |
| R. Lathom. (L. Cham-      | L. Monkswell.           |
| berlain.)                 | L. Lingen.              |
| R. Derby.                 | L. Ashbourne.           |
| R. Winchilsea and         | L. Elphinstone.         |
| Nottingham.               | L. Herschell            |
| R. Chesterfield.          | L. Hillingdon.          |
| R. Landerdale.            | V. Sidmouth.            |
| R. Dundonald.             | V. Gordon. (E. Aber-    |
| R. Cowper.                | deen.)                  |
| R. Stanhope.              | V. Oxenbridge.          |
| R. Waldegrave.            | V. Cross.               |
| R. Spencer.               | L. Bp. London.          |
| R. Lucas.                 | L. Bp. Winchester.      |
| R. Belmore.               | L. Bp. Ely.             |
| R. Harrowby.              | L. Bp. Manchester.      |

VOL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

|                       |                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| L. Knutsford. (One    | L. Kenry. (E. Dun- |
| of Her Majesty's      | raven and Mount-   |
| Principal Secre-      | Earl.)             |
| taries of State.)     | L. Hartismere (L.  |
| L. Willoughby de      | Henniker.)         |
| Eresby.               | L. Wolverton.      |
| L. Zouche of Haryng-  | L. Sandhurst.      |
| worth.                | L. Harlech.        |
| L. Windsor.           | L. Norton.         |
| L. Clifford of Chud-  | L. Shute. (V. Bar- |
| leigh.                | ington.)           |
| L. Balfour.           | L. Watson.         |
| L. Boyle. (E. Cork    | L. Lamington.      |
| and Orrery.)          | L. Rowton.         |
| L. Lovaine. (E.       | L. Brabourne.      |
| Percy.)               | L. Reay.           |
| L. Thurlow.           | L. Hothfield.      |
| L. Carrington.        | L. Grimthorpe.     |
| L. Meldrum. (M.       | L. Kensington.     |
| Huntly.)              | L. Brassey.        |
| L. Foxford. (E. Lime- | L. Thring.         |
| rick.)                | L. Macnaghten.     |
| L. Colchester.        | L. Basing.         |
| L. Ker. (M. Lothian.) | L. De Ramsey.      |
| L. Poltimore.         | L. Morris.         |
| L. Leigh.             | L. Field.          |
| L. Belper.            | L. Sandford.       |
| L. Houghton.          | L. Hannen.         |

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

## CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT, 1881, AMENDMENT BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed. (No. 17.)

House adjourned at half past Four o'clock, till Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 19th February, 1892.

## PETITION.

## THE OPIUM TRADE.

MR. MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbright): I have to present a spontaneous Petition, signed by 22,000 inhabitants of India and Burmah, against the opium trade in India, and I request that the prayer of the Petitioners may be read by the Clerk at the Table.

Petition presented, and read by the Clerk.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask you, Mr. Speaker, can this Petition be placed on the Minutes of

the House, and appear as part of our proceedings?

MR. SPEAKER: It will be treated as Petitions are treated—in the ordinary way.

### QUESTIONS.

#### AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE BY PARCELS POST.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture urging the desirableness of the provision of increased facilities by Parcels Post, so as to include the transmission of agricultural produce; and whether he is prepared to give effect to that view, so that the present high rates for the conveyance of small parcels of dairy and other farm produce may be reduced?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): The proposal has received careful investigation, but I am not at present able to offer expectations of being able to assent to it.

#### UNPENSIONED VETERANS OF THE CRIMEAN WAR AND INDIAN MUTINY.

MR. LEON (Bucks, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in accordance with his statement in July last, a list has been prepared of the most necessitous men among the unpensioned veterans of the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny; and whether the name of William Young, of Wolverton, Bucks, formerly of the 2nd and 3rd Battalion Grenadier Guards, appears on that list?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My answer to the first paragraph in the question is—Yes; and to the second—No. The man referred to had not sufficient service to be eligible for the pension promised last year; but, as I have already stated, I am considering whether it will be possible to reduce the qualifying service.

MR. LEON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman when the list will be published?

*Mr. Mac Neill*

MR. E. STANHOPE: It is not going to be published.

#### INDIAN FACTORY ACT REGULATIONS

MR. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India if he will obtain and lay upon the Table a Copy of the Regulations which were to be prepared by the Government of India relating to the Factory Act, which became Law in India on the 1st January last?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): Yes, Sir; the Regulations when received will be laid on the Table.

MR. PROVAND: But will the hon. Gentleman say when will they be received? How long shall we have to wait for them?

MR. CURZON: I cannot say at the moment.

#### OFFICERS OF THE INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, before a reply is sent by the Treasury to the Petition of the Supervisors, Officers, and Assistants of Inland Revenue, presented in March last, he will be kind enough to grant a short interview to one representative of each of the three classes?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): I regret that I am unable to comply with the request in the hon. Member's question. The Petition of the Excise Office and the Report of the Board of Inland Revenue are before me, and I see no advantage in taking the very unusual course of granting an interview to any of the memorialists.

MR. COBB: The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that within the limits of a memorial of reasonable size it is difficult to mention all the points and to make the representations that arise. If the right hon. Gentleman is unable to have an interview with the memorialists, will the Permanent Secretary to the Treasury appoint an interview?

MR. GOSCHEN: No; I am afraid I cannot hold out any such hope. I

proper course is for the officers to make their representations through the Heads of their Departments. It is impossible to arrange that this shall be done by personal interview with the Secretary.

MR. COBB: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that that course has already been suggested in an answer from Somerset House? Sir Algernon West said the only remaining course was for the memorialists to ask for an interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. GOSCHEN: No; I think that must be a mistake. The Board of Inland Revenue would not make such a suggestion. The hon. Gentleman must be labouring under some mistake.

MR. COBB: I can tell the right hon. Gentleman that I was present when Sir Algernon West made the suggestion. If I can show the right hon. Gentleman that was so, will he agree to adopt that course?

MR. GOSCHEN: No; not even if Sir Algernon West suggested that course. It is one that would embarrass all succeeding Governments. It is impossible that a Chancellor of the Exchequer could place himself in personal communication with all Civil servants who may think they have a grievance, or who wish to have their salaries raised.

#### THE BRITISH VICE CONSUL IN PARIS.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the British Vice Consul in Paris acted as second in a duel fought in or near Paris last November; and, if so, whether any notice has been taken, or is intended to be taken, by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in regard to the Vice Consul's conduct?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): No information on the subject has been received at the Foreign Office; nor has any intimation reached the Secretary of State that any charge of such a character has been made against the gentleman referred to.

MR. ESSLEMONT: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to inquire whether such a charge can be supported,

if I put him in possession of information that seems to leave no doubt on the subject?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I should like to point out to the hon. Member that at present there is no evidence that any offence punishable either by the law of this country or of France was committed.

MR. ESSLEMONT: I desire to point out—I desire to ask the hon. Gentleman whether, without reference to any offence having been committed, it is a fact that the Vice Consul did act as second in a duel?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I have already told the hon. Member we have not the shadow of a shade of evidence of any such thing having occurred.

MR. ESSLEMONT: If I put the hon. Gentleman in possession of evidence in relation to this matter, will inquiry be made?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: If the hon. Member will forward such evidence the Secretary of State, no doubt, will consider it.

#### THEOLOGICAL TESTS IN SCOTCH UNIVERSITIES.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Scottish University Commissioners have, more than a year ago, taken all the evidence they think necessary on the subject of Theological Tests, on which they were directed, by the 18th section of the Act of 1889, to make a Special Report to Her Majesty; and whether, if this be so, it is the intention of the Commissioners to present that Special Report forthwith, considering that till it has been presented, and an opportunity given for legislation regarding Tests, the ordinances necessary for dealing with the Faculty of Divinity in the Universities cannot be proceeded with?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I am informed that the Commissioners closed the evidence on the subject referred to some time ago, and they hope to be in a position to present their Report to Her Majesty at an early date.

MR. BRYCE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Report is likely to be laid on the Table?



SIR C. J. PEARSON: I have given the reply I have received, and I am afraid I cannot go further.

THE ARMAGH GUARDIANS AND THE LOWER BANN DRAINAGE.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Armagh Board of Guardians have by resolution protested against taxing the ratepayers of the union for the drainage of the Lower Bann, and declaring that the taxation should be raised on the lands benefited, supplemented by a large Imperial grant; and whether it is his intention to take any action in the matter?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I have made inquiries, and I cannot find any such resolution.

QUARTER SESSIONS AT CLOUGH, TYRONE.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if he is aware that at the January Quarter Sessions at Clough, County Tyrone, during the hearing of the case of "Venables v. Peebles," the defendant occupied a seat on the Bench; that at the same Sessions 200 defended cases were tried in four hours, and that the solicitors were cautioned against cross-examining witnesses; and whether he will call the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the matter?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): The hon. Member appears to be under some misapprehension. The case of "Venables v. Peebles" was not heard at the January Sessions at Clough, and at those Sessions some 25 or 30 cases were tried, not 200, as stated in the question. There does not appear to be anything to which the attention of the Lord Chancellor should be called.

HAULBOWLINE DOCK.

MR. MORROGH (Cork Co., S.E.): I beg to ask the Representative of the Admiralty if the First Lord has received a resolution in reference to the Haulbowline Dock passed by the Town Commissioners of Queenstown

on the 1st instant; and what attention he is prepared to give to the matter?

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ASHMEAD BARTLETT, Sheffield, Eccleshall): I presume the hon. Member refers to communications in favour of undertaking dockyard work at Haulbowline. The Board of Admiralty never intended that a dockyard should be established for building ships at Haulbowline. The dock has been constructed there with a view to the repair of ships in an emergency.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): May I ask the hon. Gentleman if half a million of money has been spent on the construction of a dock there, and for what purpose? Also, why ships are brought from Irish waters to English dockyards for their annual overhauling?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: As I have said, the dock was constructed with a view to repairs on an emergency. It is true that a large sum was expended on its construction.

MR. MORROGH: Are there no workshops and appliances at Haulbowline for dockyard work?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Yes, there are workshops which are capable of doing slight repairs, though, if serious repairs were contemplated, it would be necessary to make considerable additions to staff and machinery.

MR. MORROGH: I shall put further question.

LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps are being taken for the rapid completion of the proposed lighting of the Red Sea; whether the Turkish or Egyptian Government have a large surplus at the disposal from Red Sea light dues; and whether he is aware that, in the opinion of the most experienced captains of steamers, lights are urgently needed on the Red Sea on the island of Abu-A on the island Gebel Teer, and also on Mocha?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I regret that considerable delay has arisen in the negotiations relating to this matter. It is due to the excessive demands

parties to whom the Sublime Porte had granted a concession for erecting lights on Ottoman territory, which includes the places mentioned in the question. The Egyptian Government have a considerable surplus from Red Sea light dues, and an arrangement has been come to, according to which, as soon as the new Customs Tariff comes into force, the sum of £E40,000 will be set aside for the erection and maintenance of the additional lights required in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. It is possible that the difficulty may be overcome by the selection of an alternative route to that hitherto followed. The matter is engaging the attention of the Foreign Office and of the Board of Trade.

#### HOLYWOD PIER, COUNTY DOWN.

MR. SEXTON (on behalf of Mr. M'CARTAN, Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, with reference to Holywod Pier, County Down, whether he will state on what date the transfer of sale was completed, and the consideration for which the transfer was made; whether an undertaking was given by the purchasers that, on completion of the transfer, steps would be taken by them for its repair; and whether the plans of the proposed repairs have been lodged yet at the Harbour Office, Belfast, or if any steps have been taken to repair the pier and harbour works?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Holywod Pier has been transferred on several occasions since 1882, when the Provisional Order was obtained. I am not aware of the consideration for which any of these transfers were made, or of undertakings which may have accompanied them. In February, 1890, and again in April, 1891, I promised the hon. Member that whenever plans of new works at the pier were submitted to the Board of Trade the Belfast Harbour Commissioners would be consulted, and notice of the application given in the locality. No plans have yet been received, and the present owners have promised to do nothing without giving me notice.

#### REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE, DUBLIN.

MR. SEXTON (on behalf of Mr. M'CARTAN): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware of the complaints frequently made as to the serious delay caused in making negative searches at the Registry of Deeds Office in Dublin; whether he will state the number of requisitions for negative searches at present lodged there and not yet complied with; how many of them have been lodged upwards of one month; and on what date the first requisition for a negative search still unattended to was lodged at the office?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the negative; the answer to the second is 93, of which 21 are in progress; the answer to the third is 15, of which there are now 13 in progress; and in answer to the last paragraph, 11th January, 1892.

#### EVICTED TENANTS AND THE LAND PURCHASE ACT.

MR. W. O'BRIEN (Cork Co., N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolution of the Grand Jury at the late Fermoy Quarter Sessions, requesting Her Majesty's Government to extend the time named in the 13th clause of the Land Purchase Act of 1891 for arrangements with respect to the re-instatement of evicted tenants; whether he has also been made aware of the observations of the Recorder of Cork, to the effect that he concurred in the resolution of the Grand Jury, and that everybody would like to see the evicted tenants restored on equitable terms; and whether the Government will introduce a short Bill giving a reasonable extension of time for arrangements under the 13th clause?

MR. JACKSON: My attention has been called to the resolutions referred to, and to the observations of the Recorder of Cork, and I have to say that if information comes to me that both the landlord and the former tenant desire to avail themselves of the pro-

vision contained in Section 13 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, but find themselves precluded from so doing through the limited time in which that section was in operation, I shall consider as to the course to be taken.

**THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD  
—COUNTY ROSCOMMON.**

MR. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been made to the Congested Districts Board from a very influential meeting in Castlerea, County Roscommon, in favour of including Castlerea and Loughglynn electoral divisions in the operation of the Act; whether any decision has yet been arrived at in the matter; and whether, in considering the representation made, due weight will be given to the fact that in the County of Roscommon a special sum of money, the Reproductive Loan Fund, has been placed at the disposal of the Board?

MR. JACKSON: Yes; representations have been made to the Congested Districts Board which, I am informed, will be carefully considered, and all the circumstances, including those referred to in the question, will be taken into account.

**THE UNCOVENANTED SERVICE OF  
INDIA.**

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he can state the proportions of Europeans, Eurasians, and Indians in the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Service of India, on 31st March, 1886, under the following headings:—Rs.1,000 per annum to less than Rs.2,500; Rs.2,500 per annum to less than Rs.5,000; Rs.5,000 per annum to less than Rs.10,000; Rs.10,000 per annum to less than Rs.20,000; Rs.20,000 per annum to less than Rs.30,000; Rs.30,000 per annum to less than Rs.40,000; Rs.40,000 per annum to less than Rs.50,000; Rs.50,000 and upwards?

MR. CURZON: The figures are as follows:—Salaries of Rs.50,000 and upwards, 26 Europeans, one native; Rs.40,000 to Rs.50,000, 47 Europeans, three natives; Rs.30,000 to Rs.40,000, 125 Europeans; Rs. 20,000 to

Rs.30,000, 346 Europeans, three Eurasians, two natives; Rs.10,000 to Rs.20,000, 951 Europeans, 12 Eurasians, 40 natives; Rs.5,000 to Rs.10,000, 2,078 Europeans, 111 Eurasians, 446 natives; Rs.2,500 to Rs. 5,000, 1,334 Europeans, 545 Eurasians, 1,647 natives; Rs.1,000 to Rs.2,500, 2,097 Europeans, 1,963 Eurasians, 6,915 natives. Total—7,004 Europeans, 2,634 Eurasians, 9,054 natives.

MR. MAC NEILL: I thank the hon. Gentleman for this very full information. May I further ask him whether it is not the fact that of all the Indian officials, both Covenanted and Uncovenanted Service, now on salaries of Rs.5,000 and upwards, there are 3,573 Europeans and 492 natives?

MR. CURZON: That is scarcely a question I can answer without notice.

**LAGOS TRADE.**

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Government have any information as to the stoppage of the trade routes from Lagos to the interior and, if so, what steps are being taken to remove these obstructions to legitimate trade caused by the hostile action of the native tribes?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron H. de WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): An arrangement has lately been made with the Jebus, by which free passage for trade through their country has been secured, and the Papers on the subject will shortly be laid before Parliament. Information was received a few days ago by telegraph from the Governor that the road to Abeokuta had been closed. The Governor has been authorised by telegraph, in reply, to address a strong letter of remonstrance to the Egbas, informing them that if the roads are not opened the matter will be reported to Her Majesty's Government, who will decide what further action should be taken.

**PAUPER RELIEF, 1891.**

MR. SUMMERS (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state what was the total number of persons in England and Wales who

*Mr. Jackson*

were in receipt of relief at any time between 1st January, 1891, and 31st December, 1891; and whether he would consent to the publication of annual Returns of the total number of paupers throughout the year, in addition to the Returns now presented of persons in receipt of relief on particular days of the year?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): If the hon. Member will refer to the terms of the Return moved for on the 11th, I think he will find that the Return will include the information he desires. It is a Return which will take considerable labour to prepare, so I cannot vouch for it being laid on the Table at a very early date.

MR. A. ACLAND (York, W.R., Rotherham): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if, in addition, he can give the Returns for particular days in the year?

\*MR. RITCHIE: I know that the hon. Gentleman desires that and other particulars, but to avoid delay we have to limit the information, and cannot embrace all the points upon which information may be desired. I am anxious that the Return shall be as correct as possible. I am considering that particular point. I sympathise with the object of the hon. Member, and, if I can manage, it shall be done.

SIR W. FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the ages of those in receipt of relief?

\*MR. RITCHIE: Within certain limits. Of course, we could go on from age to age; but it would add enormously to the labour of preparing the Return, and increase delay. Looking at the interesting discussions going on lately, I think the House would desire to have, as soon as possible, the Return as referring to the particular age of 65.

SIR W. FOSTER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in one of the Bills introduced this Session a provision is introduced that persons in receipt of relief for a certain number of years before 65 are not eligible for pensions? Therefore, the ages between 55 and 65 become important in reference to suggested legislation?

\*MR. RITCHIE: If the Return were to be prepared so as to give all the information in reference to Bills introduced, I am afraid there would be a very great extension of the time and labour necessary in the preparation.

#### FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture when he proposes to re-introduce the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I do not propose to reintroduce this Bill at present. The subject is so highly technical, and I found so many difficulties in the preparation of the Bill, and so many objections were taken to the measure prepared last Session, that I propose to arrange for the investigation of the subject by a Departmental Committee before introducing a further measure.

MR. CHANNING: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how long this Committee will be occupied with the subject?

\*MR. CHAPLIN: It is impossible for me to express an opinion at present; but I shall be very glad to give the hon. Member any further information on that point as soon as it is in my power.

#### TRAINING OF THE NORFOLK MILITIA.

MR. SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is in contemplation to remove the annual training of the Norfolk regiments of Militia from Norwich this year; and whether, taking into consideration the fact that the Corporation of Norwich has supplied a site for the dépôt barracks and suitable ground for training and exercise, he will, before coming to a decision, consider the great disappointment and loss which will be caused to the citizens of Norwich if the annual training is not allowed to take place there as usual?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Although it will be necessary that the 3rd Battalion of the Norfolk Regiment should have the same opportunity of being trained with one of its line battalions as other Militia regiments, there are reasons why I think it may this year be trained

at Norwich. As regards the 4th Battalion, the men are largely drawn from Great Yarmouth, and the officer commanding considers that to train there will be beneficial to recruiting. This battalion is only occasionally trained at Norwich?

#### ROYALTIES ON GOLD MINING.

MR. PRITCHARD MORGAN (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the necessity of increasing the metallic reserves of the country, he has yet considered the question of reducing the royalties upon gold, so that the Crown may not take so large a proportion as two-thirds of the profits obtained from such a class of ore as gives 10 per cent. profit upon its production and treatment, as in the case of the Clonga and other Crown mines in Wales?

MR. GOSCHEN: In reply to the hon. Member, I may refer him to my answer given yesterday as to the reduction made in royalties upon ore of low grade.

#### MR. SHALLARD, LATE WRITER IN THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the case of Mr. Shallard, writer in the Ordnance Department, who was dismissed on the ground that he had uttered sentiments very unusual in a Government *employé*, and that he had come into contact with the police?

MR. E. STANHOPE: A writer of the name of Shallard was dismissed from the Ordnance Store Department at Woolwich for being absent without leave, with the intimation that an individual who had been convicted and fined for collision with the police was an undesirable person to employ in the Public Service. The case was brought to my notice, and I saw no reason to interfere with the action of the Local Authorities.

#### COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH BRAZIL.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in

view of the special advantages conferred by the Republic of Brazil in the duties which she levies on the cotton goods and other productions of the United States of America, Her Majesty's Government is endeavouring to obtain similar advantages for the manufactures of the United Kingdom; and, if so, what is the present position of such negotiations?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: Communications on the subject have been made to the Government of Brazil, but up to the present time that Government has not been willing to enter into negotiations for a Commercial Treaty with this country.

MR. SCHWANN: Does my hon. Friend know whether similar arrangements to those with the United States have been made between European countries and Brazil?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I must ask for notice of that question.

#### WORK AT WOOLWICH ARSENAL.

COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if there is any truth in the allegations as to extra night shifts having been recently employed at Woolwich Arsenal, and if, having regard to the apprehension excited thereby in the minds of private firms and their *employés* in the presence of an increasing slackness of work in the iron and steel trades, he will give directions that night work is not to be resorted to, or additions made to the Arsenal working staff, plant, or shops, without his personal authorisation?

MR. E. STANHOPE: No increase in the number of men necessarily employed on night shifts at Woolwich Arsenal has taken place. On the contrary, there has been a slight decrease quite recently. Except in cases of absolute necessity, I am altogether opposed to them. No night work or extensions of the ordnance factories are undertaken without the personal approval of the Financial Secretary or myself. As some idea appears to prevail that the ordnance factories are working at high pressure while the trade is suffering, I invite my hon. Friend to visit the Arsenal for himself,

*Mr. E. Stanhope*

id to see what is going on. Every cility shall be afforded to him.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brighton): Will the right hon. Gentleman say, has there been any increase in the steel forges in the Department since he gave me the answer last year?

MR. E. STANHOPE: It would be better to give notice of these questions; but I have already said we have absolutely given up the manufacture of large steel forges, but we do employ small steel forges.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF NATIVES IN THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether it is true, as stated in the *St. James's Gazette* of 18th February, in an article entitled "India for the Indians," that in regard to the recruitment for the Provincial or Local Services in India, Lord Cross and his advisers have departed from the recommendations of the Public Service Commission; that the appointments which are now to be opened to the Provincial Services are to be strictly reserved for natives in India; and that not only a third of the Session Judgeships, but one-sixth also of the Collectorships will be filled by natives?

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the hon. Gentleman permit me to ask him a question, of which I have given him private notice, whether the recommendation of the Public Service Commission referred to in the question of the hon. Baronet is that Indians and Europeans who have lived in India three years should be equally eligible for the Provincial Service; and whether Lord Cross in his despatch, 12th September, 1889, departs from that recommendation requiring that the appointments shall be filled in India; is it in the power of the Government to make such a change by executive order?

MR. CURZON: The question put by the hon. Member varies from that of which he has given me notice. I shall be glad if he will put a Notice on the Paper. In reply to the hon. Baronet, I have to say that information on the subject will be found in the correspondence presented to Parliament in 1891.

#### RIFLE RANGE AT NEWTOWNARDS.

MR. MACARTNEY (on behalf of Colonel Waring, Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has come to any decision with regard to the rifle range at Newtownards; and whether he is aware of the strong feeling in favour of its retention?

MR. E. STANHOPE: The lease under which the Newtownards range was held has expired. To have rendered that range safe for the Lee-Metford rifle would have entailed very great expense, and a suitable range has therefore been obtained elsewhere.

#### A RIFLE RANGE AT PORTMARNOCK.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet considered the Memorial presented to him against the establishment of a rifle range and military camp at Portmarnock, in the County of Dublin; and, if so, whether he is prepared to state the conclusion at which he has arrived on the subject?

MR. E. STANHOPE: The question is still under my personal consideration. Perhaps the hon. Member will communicate with me in about a fortnight's time.

#### CROWN LANDS AT BILLINGBOROUGH.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what extent of land has been let in allotments upon the Crown lands at Billingborough, in the County of Lincoln, and what number of allotments have been granted exceeding a quarter of an acre, and exceeding half an acre up to one acre; and whether the statement is correct that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests have resolved not to let more than 30 acres for allotments in any one parish?

SIR J. GORST: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this question. There are 41 acres 2 roods 9 perches of the Crown estate at Billingborough let in allotments. There are 86 of them, few being less than a quarter of an acre, 57 exceeding quarter of an acre, and 12

exceeding half an acre. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

### MOTIONS.

#### TEACHERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Arthur Acland, Bill to provide for the Registration of Teachers, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Sydney Buxton, and Mr. Hobhouse.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 178.]

#### CORONERS' ACT (1887) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir Walter Foster, Bill to amend "The Coroners' Act, 1887," ordered to be brought in by Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Addison, Mr. Roby, Mr. H. S. Wright, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. John Kelly.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 179.]

#### WOMEN COUNTY COUNCILLORS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Stuart, Bill to enable Women to be elected to, and to serve on, County Councils, ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Henry J. Wilson, and Mr. Channing.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 180.]

#### AGRICULTURAL TENANTS IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill to compensate Agricultural Tenants for all Improvements, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Mr. Thomas Ellis, Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Halley Stewart, and Mr. George Lambert.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 181.]

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

#### COUNTY COURT JUDGES IN WALES.

##### RESOLUTION.

(4.3.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, &c.): I rise, Sir, to call attention to the recent appointment of a County Court Judge in Wales, and to move—

"That this House, in the interests of the due administration of justice, and in face of the Resolution of this House of the 8th March, 1872, regrets the appointment to the judgeship of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken, of a gentleman who is unable to speak or understand that language."

*Sir J. Gorst*

In submitting this Resolution House I wish at the outset to disavow any personal feeling and any desire to make any personal attack upon a gentleman who has been fortunate in securing this appointment. I have some experience of the courtesies which he treats professional men with; that disarms opposition at once. It is only as a matter of course that I have brought this Resolution before the House, and I think I am justified in asking from the Members responsible some explanation of the perpetration of what appears to me only like a job. The great majority of the people of the district over which this Judge has control—the well-to-do classes, the squirearchy and the gentry—understand the English language, but the poorer classes have no direct practical acquaintance with it, and enable them to conduct their business with anything like precision in the County Court, which is pre-eminently a Court of the poor. The artisan, the quarrymen, and the agricultural labourers transact all their business in the Welsh language, and it is a gross injustice that to a district in which the vast majority of the people speak nothing but Welsh, a Judge should be appointed to determine differences who does not understand the language in which they plead their causes. It may, of course, be said that competent interpreters are appointed in these Courts, and I have no objection to say anything derogatory of the gentlemen, but as a rule the professional men, who are acquainted with the English language, they very often fail to do so, and to understand either the facts or the questions. In Carnarvon and Bangor the gentlemen who act as interpreters have great knowledge of the language and great literary gifts. Sir, it is impossible for an interpreter, however skilful, to convey to the Court all the shades and differences of meaning in a witness's answers. In case words are used which have a special meaning the interpreter is responsible. In 1872, on the Motion of the right hon. Member for East Devonshire (Mr. Osborne Morgan), the House passed a Resolution to the effect

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in the interest of the due administration of justice, that the Judge of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken should, so far as the limits of selection will allow, be able to speak and understand that language."

Now, here is a Judge recently appointed to a Welsh-speaking district, and it is pretended that he has any knowledge whatever of the Welsh language, although there were at least half-a-dozen barristers qualified by their knowledge of the language amongst the applicants for this judgeship. The opinion of all classes throughout Wales is hostile to this appointment. Not only Welsh Liberals deprecate it, but gentlemen who have no sympathy with the views of those sitting on this side of the House condemn it. Sir John Treleaven, the Bishop of Bangor, and Mr. Vaughan—men who do not hold strong political views—are agreed in condemning the action of the Government. In University and in legal circles the appointment is condemned. The *Law Times* says:—

"Lord Halsbury has appointed his brothers, his wife's relations, his friends' friends, and, occasionally those who have done service to a Party; but it never seems to have occurred to him to be necessary that a man should be a good lawyer, and have some experience at the bar in order to be a good Judge."

Similar opinions have been expressed by other legal authorities, but I rest my case upon the Resolution of the House of Lords, and I think appointments of this character, in defiance of the express order of the House of Commons, really amounts to contempt. I beg to move the Resolution standing in my name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, in the interests of the due administration of justice, and in face of the resolution of this House of 8th March 1872, regrets the appointment to the judgeship of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken, of a gentleman who is unable to speak or understand that language,"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*),—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question."

MR. DAVID THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I desire, Sir, to second the

Motion, and I do so on precisely similar grounds to those upon which my hon. Friend based his case. I am sorry it should be necessary to dispel certain illusions which have taken hold of the mind of the people in England. It is suggested again that we are once more raising the cry of "Wales for the Welsh," and that we are endeavouring to foster the Welsh language. For my own part, I desire explicitly to repudiate that suggestion. We have no desire to raise any such cry, for that would imply a confession of our inability to compete with Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen upon equal grounds. Nor have we any desire to stimulate the Welsh language by artificial means. The Welsh language is very well able to take care of itself. But, Sir, what I wish to point out to the House is this: that the Resolution passed in 1872 refers particularly to this district to which Judge Beresford has been appointed, a district which forms one of the most Welsh parts of Wales. I do not know what the defence of the Government may be, or if they will set up any at all, but it has occurred to me that possibly this appointment was due to an oversight on their part. If they defend themselves by saying this is not a Welsh-speaking district, I would remind them that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Denbighshire raised the question in 1872 in relation to this very circuit to which Judge Beresford has been appointed. A larger number of people speak Welsh to-day than was the case in 1872, though I do not say that the proportion is larger; but, in consequence of the increase in population, the actual number is greater now than in 1872. The present Government has repeatedly recognised the necessity for appointing Welsh-speaking officials. That was done, for example, in the Factory Act and in the Mines Regulation Act. I have nothing to say against Judge Beresford. I have always heard him spoken of as an extremely fair-minded man, and until to-day I knew nothing about his connection with the Prime Minister. Upon his legal qualifications I do not feel competent to express any opinion, but I do say that the appointment of an English-speaking Judge to a Welsh-speaking district,



in the face of the Resolution of 1872, is more or less a reflection on the Welsh-speaking barristers of the North and South Wales Circuits, and on the Welsh Stipendiary Magistrates, who are of sufficient standing for the post of County Court Judge. Selections from the Stipendiary Magistrates have already been made, as in the case of Judge Bishop and Judge Gwilym Williams. If the Government are prepared to defend the appointment, I hope the House will not hesitate to express its strong condemnation of the contempt shown by the Government for the Resolution passed in 1872. That Resolution requires not merely that *ceteris paribus* preference should be given to Welsh-speaking barristers, but that a Welsh-speaking barrister shall be appointed to the Mid Wales Circuit if a competent man can be found.

\*(4.20.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): I can assure the hon. Gentlemen the Mover and the Seconder of this Amendment that I sympathise to a very great extent with what I may call the national sentiment to which they have referred in many of the observations they have made. I have not the slightest intention of saying a word in depreciation of the Welsh language, with which, unfortunately, I am not acquainted. But I confess that as this Amendment has been moved and seconded in language which suggests that a contempt of the Resolution of the House of Commons has been committed, I think it is desirable that the House should have a few facts, and should know a little more about the history of this matter. If what the hon. Gentlemen allege is a contempt of the House of Commons it is a contempt of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and many other right hon. Gentlemen who acted when the Resolution was much more recent than it is at the present time, have also been guilty. I am not going to draw distinctions between the barristers who could and who could not speak Welsh, because I have, in my present position, the privilege of knowing a great deal of the members of my profession, and I will assume the Mover and the Seconder

of this Amendment said what was perfectly right when they said that they were gentlemen at the Bar who possess a knowledge of Welsh, and would be well qualified to discharge the duties of a County Court Judge. But having regard to the history of this Resolution and what happened since, I would submit those who proposed this Amendment, that in their somewhat severe strictures upon Her Majesty's Government they rather overshot the mark. The Resolution that was passed in 1872 was passed upon a question that referred to this particular Circuit—the Mid Wales Circuit. The first appointment made after the Resolution of 1872 was in October, 1873, when one of the most honoured of our County Court Judges was appointed, and I am quite sure that than he (afterwards Sir) Horatio Lloyd, there never was a more competent man who sat upon the Bench. I believe that Sir Horatio Lloyd was not able to speak Welsh, and was not able to more than understand a very little of it. He was appointed on his merits. I know Sir Horatio Lloyd has constantly been in Welsh-speaking districts, and I am not aware of a single complaint ever having been made against him based upon the fact that he was not able to speak the Welsh language. The next appointment that was made was in January, 1878, and it was that of a very distinguished lawyer, the father of the gentleman whose name has given rise to this Amendment. I knew him intimately; and though he did not wear a silk gown, there was no more distinguished lawyer who was constantly consulted, as I know in cases of great importance. Parts of the circuit over which Judge Beresford presided were most unquestionably in the Welsh-speaking districts. He was there for 13 years. Mr. Beresford presided with great satisfaction on his Court for all these years. (Cries "No, no.") Hon. Members opposite must pardon me for saying that I speak with an intimate knowledge of the profession, and I am not aware of a suggestion ever made that he was not one of the most distinguished and competent of our County Court Judges. The next appointment was in February, 18

*Mr. David Thomas*

at the time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian was Prime Minister, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was Home Secretary, and Lord Selborne was Lord Chancellor. At that time the Resolution of the House of Commons was well known. Yet who was appointed? Why, Mr. Owen to Brecknockshire and Glamorganshire, and he had no qualification whatever as to speaking Welsh. I will not argue the merits of the case; but we know that the Government, which had as a Member of it one who was as much a Welshman as my right hon. Friend opposite, made appointments inconsistent with this Resolution. It seems to me to be very strong to speak of action taken some seven years later as being in contempt of that Resolution. In October, 1884, Mr. E. Williams was appointed by the then Lord Chancellor to the Circuit also including Brecknock and parts of Glamorganshire. In January, 1886, Mr. Bishop was appointed; and I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Lord Chancellor, who is said to be contemptuous of the Resolution, so appointed a gentleman who did speak the Welsh language. In July, 1885, just after our coming into office, Mr. Brymnor Jones was appointed. He also is able to speak Welsh, although he is now a distinguished County Court Judge in districts where Welsh speaking is not required. I desire, further, to point out that Her Majesty's Government, when they have had to decide these questions mainly on the advice of the Lord Chancellor, have made more appointments of Welsh-speaking Judges than the Government of the right hon. Member for Midlothian. I am not here to say that his Honour, Judge Beresford, is a better lawyer, or better qualified to sit as a County Court Judge, than other members of the Bar of that Circuit. In fact, I was a little surprised to hear the hon. Member for Carnarvon limit the number of other gentlemen equally well qualified to six. The circumstances affecting Mr. Beresford were certainly unusual. His father was a County Court Judge for 13 years in the adjoining district, Circuit 31. He had not been in good health during his later years, and Mr.

Cecil Beresford had sat for him repeatedly. I am doing no more than justice when I state that while so sitting as a Deputy Judge he gave universal satisfaction, and I do not believe that any professional Member of this House, who ever practised before him, will say anything to the contrary. And that is not all. There came from the district in which he had sat as a Judge—a district in which, according to the contention of the hon. Mover and Seconder of this Motion, a Welsh-speaking Judge was required—a very largely signed Petition asking for his appointment. I do not suppose the gentlemen who presented that Petition were indifferent to the consideration as to a Welsh-speaking Judge, and I dare say they were ignorant of the Resolution of the House of Commons, which had been disregarded on five or six occasions before. But Mr. Beresford was appointed accordingly. His Honour Judge Bishop, who was then Judge of Circuit No. 28, Mid-Wales, was transferred to the Circuit over which the late Judge Beresford had presided, and Mr. Beresford was appointed to No. 28. I have taken some pains to inform myself as to what has happened during the time Mr. Beresford has been sitting as Judge, and it is no exaggeration to say that when the question arose of his removal to another place, persons of all parties and all sections of the Press, without regard to politics, expressed a hope that he would not be removed. I think it is only common fairness to an absent Member of the Government to ask hon. Members to come to the conclusion that he fairly considered this point on its merits, especially as he had himself on two previous occasions appointed a gentleman who could speak Welsh, and I would suggest to this House that the idea of a contemptuous intention to disregard the Resolution of 1872 is an exaggeration. I do not wish to argue at any length the question of the necessity of appointing Welsh-speaking Judges. I am not going to suggest that it should not be taken into consideration; but I do know this, from barristers practising in these Courts, that repeatedly witnesses who are examined in Welsh answer in English, and also ask that questions

may be put in English. I am not suggesting that there are no cases at times when knowledge of the language would be desirable, but I am referring to the general practice. I believe that for many years past every child in Wales has been taught English as well as Welsh. It is an honour to the Welsh nation that that should be so; but so far as this demand is concerned, it has been certainly decreasing in importance from 1872 down to 1891. I hope I have shown no feeling but one of sympathy with the national sentiment of Wales, for I have not the slightest intention of going in face of the Resolution of the House of Commons, or outraging the feelings of hon. Members from Wales; and I trust that those who may follow me will deal with my remarks in the same spirit as that in which I have addressed them in this House.

(4.45.) MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.): I must say I am very much disappointed with the explanation which the hon. and learned Gentleman has offered. The only defence he has set up for the Government of which he is a Member is, that other Governments have done the same thing; but even if that were so, two blacks do not make a white. I do not regard this as in any way a Party question, and therefore I shall put aside all he has said on that subject. Now what are the facts? Mr. Horatio Lloyd, who, I believe, was appointed under the Government of the right hon. Member for Midlothian, does not speak the Welsh language; but, if my memory serves me, he told me on the occasion of his appointment that he was able to understand what Welsh witnesses said, and to check any mistakes they made. In February, 1884, Mr. Gwyn-Owen was appointed to the post, and I should have supposed that anyone bearing that name would speak Welsh. He was very soon after transferred to another post, and Mr. Gwilym Williams, one of the best Welsh scholars, I know, was appointed to it. From that time every County Court Judge who has held that post has been perfectly competent to deal with Welsh witnesses, and to speak and understand the language. The Attorney General says that he does not wish to

argue the question of appointing Welsh-speaking Judges in Welsh-speaking districts, and I am not surprised, because the question is concluded by the Resolution of the House of Commons, which, if it means anything, means that if you can get a competent man who speaks the Welsh language, he should be appointed. The Resolution which I had the honour of bringing forward, and I am sorry to say I believe I am the only Member now left in the House of Commons who took part in the Debate on that occasion, dealt with the very circuit with which we are now dealing, and there never was a question so exhaustively debated, or a Resolution at which the House arrived with such perfect unanimity. The only shadow of objection to it was an old Statute of Henry VIII., which has since been repealed. Speaking on that occasion as the representative of the Government, my noble Friend Lord Aberdare, then Mr. Bruce, said legal fitness was, of course, always the first consideration; but he was sure, after what they had heard that night, that for the future Governments would have regard to a knowledge of Welsh in making these appointments. Are we to understand that there is a Government now in Office which has no regard to the qualification of speaking Welsh? because, if it is so, it is desirable that we should know it. I see the Home Secretary in his place, and remember the answer he gave in reply to a Motion I made as to the appointment of a Sub-Inspector, who could not speak Welsh, to a mining district in which the Welsh language was almost exclusively spoken. As soon as that appointment was made I had, as Chairman of Petty Sessions, to adjudicate upon a summons taken out by that gentleman against the lessees of the mine for a breach of the Mines Regulation Act. The prosecution broke down on other grounds, but in any case it must have broken down, because the Mining Inspector could not speak a word of Welsh, and those from whom he got his information could not speak a word of English, so that the whole of the proceedings had to be carried on in a sort of dumb show. That is not exactly the same case as this, but, at any rate, if the

*Sir Richard Webster*

right hon. Gentleman had heard it argued, he would have felt as I do, that it was wrong to appoint a gentleman to that office who could not speak the Welsh language. The hon. Gentleman the Attorney General did not put forward any kind of defence against the Motion, for he did not even suggest that a good man could not have been found who could speak Welsh. It used to be said, when complaints were made of the non-appointment of Welsh-speaking Bishops, that you could not find a Welshman competent to take the post, but that objection is now never raised, and whatever we may think of the political or other opinions of the Welsh Bishops, able men do not sit upon the Episcopal Bench. What I want to impress upon the hon. and learned Gentleman is the fact that it is not only important that we should have men who will administer justice duly, but that the people before whom they administer it should be perfectly confident that it is so administered; and unless you have a man who is familiar with the Welsh people and the Welsh language, it is perfectly impossible that such a feeling of confidence can be created. I do not think it necessary to argue the question any further, for it is really concluded by the Resolution, and as long as it stands on the Order Book of this House, to treat it as my hon. and learned Friend has just done is to treat it as if it were nothing better than waste paper. If the answer we have heard from him is all the Government can give, I sincerely trust that my hon. Friend will persevere with his Motion, and I shall be very happy to support it.

(4.55.) **SIR J. PULESTON** (Devonport): I have never wavered in my contention in favour of the principle of the Motion now moved by the hon. Member opposite, and on more than one occasion, when the question has been raised during the nearly 19 years in which I have been in this House, I have always taken exactly the same position as I do now, namely, that a Welsh-speaking barrister should always be appointed to a County Court judgeship in the Principality. The right hon. Gentleman opposite found it convenient, in view of the facts presented by the Attorney General, to say

this was not a Party question; but he will not hesitate to call it a Party question directly he gets outside this House, and he will take very good care not to explain his want of Welsh patriotism in failing to call attention to this question within a few years after the passing of his own Resolution. He passed over, in solemn silence, jobs committed by the Government of which he was himself a Member. Reference has been made to the case of Mr. Brymnor Jones. It was generally understood that there was no more brilliant man at the Bar, but when he was appointed it so happened he had just been defeated as the Liberal candidate for Mid Glamorgan.

**MR. S. EVANS:** Mr. Jones never was a candidate for that constituency.

**SIR J. PULESTON:** He was a well-known politician, and while I apologise very gladly for what I have said, I may explain that he was, at all events, mentioned in the papers as a possible candidate. I do not defend this appointment of Mr. Beresford. On the contrary, I condemn it in the strongest possible manner, and I shall vote gladly in favour of the Resolution; but I think that the Lord Chancellor probably did not have in his mind the Resolution of the House of Commons, and did have regard to precedents set by former Liberal Governments. He had other reasons, however, to suppose that the appointment of Mr. Beresford would be acceptable in Wales, for a memorial was presented which I believe was signed by an hon. Member opposite.

**MR. S. EVANS:** I did not sign the memorial, and I refused to do so.

**SIR J. PULESTON:** My authority is a paper published in his own part of Wales, and I regret that I have been misled into that statement. I do not admit that such circumstances ever occur that there is not one Welshman to be found in eight or ten years fitted to occupy the position of County Court Judge. I do not know how many applicants there were for this post, but I know several men eminent at the Bar and thoroughly conversant with the Welsh language—including a Member of this House—who would have adorned the position. I agree that what has been said does not suggest

that Mr. Beresford had not the proper legal qualifications for the post, and I regret that the hon. Member, after stating that, should have thought it necessary to read an extract from a letter to the *Law Times* condemnatory of his qualification. I hope, now that the question has been again so prominently brought forward, no appointments will in future be made in contravention of the Resolution passed in 1872. Apart from the question of the Welsh language, which is a very serious matter, we claim that we have a sentimental right to have Welshmen in Welsh places, especially as a knowledge of Welsh is essential to the right administration of justice in peculiarly Welsh districts. It is impossible to administer justice with equity through the medium of an interpreter; we know the difficulty in our own English Courts. I trust that, in future, no Lord Chancellor of any Party will venture to disregard the national aspirations and national feelings of justice and right which is attached to the appointment of Welsh County Court Judges.

(5.5.) MR. BOWEN ROWLANDS (Cardiganshire): I only desire, Sir, to say a few words on the observations which fell from the Attorney General, and first, as usual, I am bound to congratulate him upon the admirable tone and temper in which he dealt with the question. I did not expect anything else, but I was surprised at the weakness of the case he made out. He confessed that a knowledge of Welsh is an important element to consider in making the appointment of County Court Judges; then, I ask, what peculiar characteristics are there in the person now holding the post which led to that important element being disregarded in this case? I ask this the more because, though I have the honour of being acquainted with Judge Beresford, I am acquainted with barristers who are conversant with the Welsh language, and eminently qualified to adorn the position. What are the distinguishing characteristics which led to the appointment of Mr. Beresford in disregard of this admittedly important qualification, instead of others whom the Attorney General admits were capable, as capable, of

performing the duties of the office? I think the Attorney General surrendered the whole case when he admits that there were others qualified to fulfil the duties, unless some supporter of the Government gets up and points out some distinguishing characteristics in the case. Names of other Judges have been mentioned as those of men we worthy of respect. Sir Horatio Lloyd was mentioned. He was a worthy and competent Judge, but he understood Welsh enough to check witnesses, and was imbued with a thorough knowledge of Welsh life, so that he could follow the reasoning of witnesses in describing their conduct on particular occasions. All his case proves, if he were not, that some man of great ability and special qualification may be so fitted for a post as to be able to surmount the great objection of want of knowledge of the language. There is another Judge, Mr. Stevenson Owen, County Court Judge for Cardiff. The Attorney General said that he was Judge for the district of Brecknockshire and part of Glamorganshire. That is somewhat misleading. The most important part of his work is done in the English-speaking Courts of Cardiff and Newport, though he is also Judge of some small part of Brecknock. The Attorney General spoke of a memorial in Judge Beresford's favour. I do not think such memorials are to be preferred to the popular election of Judges, to which hon. Gentlemen opposite have such an objection. The right hon. Gentleman said that when it was proposed to remove him, every section of politics and school of thought united in his favour. I should like to ask, why was it proposed to remove him, unless in obedience to a large national demand for his removal? I can hardly conceive it entering into the head of the Government, unless their conscience pricked them—

SIR RICHARD WEBSTER: I said I understood that, in consequence of some correspondence as to his not speaking Welsh, a paragraph appeared in a paper to the effect that he was going to be removed, and that paragraph was repeated for some weeks.

MR. B. ROWLANDS: I thought he said it was proposed to remove Judge Beresford. I understand now that there was a tumult or excitement

*Sir J. Puleston*

ment in the country, which was shown by a large number of letters in newspapers, and articles pointing out that he was not so distinguished in other respects as to justify his being made an exception to the rule laid down so many years ago, which the Attorney General admits is very applicable to cases analogous to the present one. That there was this feeling—not against Mr. Beresford personally—is undeniable; there was a unanimous chorus of disapprobation of the appointment which was supposed, rightly or wrongly, not to be the work of the Lord Chancellor, who from his connection with Wales would have been desirous to do what was right and proper; it was supposed to be the result of some powerful motive with which the Lord Chancellor had no personal or immediate concern. If there were no particular motive, what was the reason of the appointment? Was it that his father had previously held the post of County Court Judge? The Attorney General referred to witnesses who spoke English. I do not quite understand the purport of it. He said that some witnesses about to speak in Welsh, the interpreter being sworn, answered in English instead. I have known great wrong to have been done in consequence of witnesses having been forced to speak in English who ought to have been allowed to speak in Welsh. They were able to understand the ordinary language of the oath in English, but were unable to follow the intricacies of a subtle argument, into which they were led by a skilful person. One of these Courts is in the county I represent, and I honestly believe, from my knowledge of these and other places, that a knowledge of Welsh is a very desirable thing. No one suggests that a knowledge of Welsh is to be so preferentially considered that eminent legal and other qualifications are to be deferred to it, but there is no claim of superior qualification in this case. The Attorney General says that one benefit of the Debate will be that the Resolution of 1872 will be brought into greater prominence, but he says the Government had taken it into consideration already. If these facts—the circumstances of the locality and the Resolution—had been committed to the hon. and learned Gentleman, he would, I am

certain, have appointed a person satisfactory to the Welsh people in regard to his knowledge of Welsh. The Government have disregarded a Resolution passed by the House of Commons, and whether it be called contempt or disregard is a mere question of words. This gentleman was appointed to the dissatisfaction of the Welsh people, who expressed their feeling in every constitutional way, and they now speak through their Representatives and some who desire in the future to represent them, and the hon. Gentleman opposite found himself so placed that he was bound to rise and join in the unanimous denunciation.

SIR J. PULESTON: I particularly called attention to the fact that long ago, before the question was present to the mind of the hon. Gentleman, I had spoken in this House and elsewhere as strongly on it as I have spoken to-night.

MR. B. ROWLANDS: That is what I meant to say; he is able conscientiously, in accordance with his feelings, to join us in repeating his condemnation to which he has so patriotically given voice on other occasions, and which I cordially agree with.

(5.20.) MR. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.): I hold somewhat strong opinions on the Welsh language, especially in regard to its use and influence in Wales, but I hope not so much as to bias my judgment on this point. If we were to consider the Welsh language in all its bearings in this respect I am afraid some of us who represent Welsh constituencies might not occupy the positions that we do. When the question was raised some years ago I could only find one hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for Merionethshire, who was capable of speaking Welsh. I do not, however, carry my loved Welsh to a ridiculous point. I am a lawyer myself, but, having never practised, I should like to look at this question quite apart from its legal aspect. It seems to me that this Resolution, passed in 1872, stands upon its own merits. It was proposed by a Welshman on one side of the House and accepted by a typical Welshman on the other side; but since it was passed, Governments, whether from this side or that, have refused to acknowledge the force of it. My knowledge

exceeding half an acre. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

### MOTIONS.

#### TEACHERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Arthur Acland, Bill to provide for the Registration of Teachers, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Sydney Buxton, and Mr. Hobhouse.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 178.]

#### CORONERS' ACT (1887) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir Walter Foster, Bill to amend "The Coroners' Act, 1887," ordered to be brought in by Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Addison, Mr. Roby, Mr. H. S. Wright, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. John Kelly.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 179.]

#### WOMEN COUNTY COUNCILLORS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Stuart, Bill to enable Women to be elected to, and to serve on, County Councils, ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Henry J. Wilson, and Mr. Channing.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 180.]

#### AGRICULTURAL TENANTS IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill to compensate Agricultural Tenants for all Improvements, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Mr. Thomas Ellis, Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Halley Stewart, and Mr. George Lambert.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 181.]

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

#### COUNTY COURT JUDGES IN WALES.

##### RESOLUTION.

(4.3.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, &c.): I rise, Sir, to call attention to the recent appointment of a County Court Judge in Wales, and to move—

"That this House, in the interests of the due administration of justice, and in face of the Resolution of this House of the 8th March, 1872, regrets the appointment to the judgeship of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken, of a gentleman who is unable to speak or understand that language."

*Sir J. Gorst*

In submitting this Resolution to House I wish at the outset to disavow any personal feeling and any desire to make any personal attack upon a gentleman who has been fortunate in securing this appointment. I have some experience of the courtesy which he treats professional men with; that disarms opposition on my head. It is only as a matter of fact that I have brought this Resolution before the House, and I think we are justified in asking from the Minister responsible some explanation of the perpetration of what appears to me only like a job. The great majority of the people of the district over which this Judge has control—the well-to-do classes, the squirearchy and the tradesmen—understand the English language, but the poorer classes have not sufficient practical acquaintance with it to enable them to conduct their business with anything like precision in the County Court, which is pre-eminently a Court of the poor. The artisan quarrymen, and the agricultural labourers transact all their business in the Welsh language, and it is a gross injustice that to a district in which the vast majority of the people speak nothing but Welsh, a Judge should be appointed to determine differences who does not understand the language in which they plead their causes. It may, of course, be said that competent interpreters are appointed in these Courts, and I have no objection to say anything derogatory of gentlemen, but as a rule the professional men, who are acquainted with the English language, they very often fail thoroughly to understand either the answers or the questions. In Carnarvon and Bangor the gentlemen who act as interpreters have great knowledge of the language and great literary gifts. Sir, it is impossible for an interpreter, however skilful, to convey to the Court all the shades and differences of meaning in a witness's answers. In cases where words are used which have a special meaning the interpreter is really a Judge. In 1872, on the Motion of the right hon. Member for East Devonshire (Mr. Osborne Morgan), the House passed a Resolution to the effect

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in the interest of the due administration of justice, that the Judge of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken should, so far as the limits of selection will allow, be able to speak and understand that language."

Now, here is a Judge recently appointed to a Welsh-speaking district, and it is not pretended that he has any knowledge whatever of the Welsh language, although there were at least half-a-dozen barristers qualified by their knowledge of the language amongst the applicants for this judgeship. The opinion of all classes throughout Wales is hostile to this appointment. Not merely Welsh Liberals deprecate it, but gentlemen who have no sympathy with the views of those sitting on this side of the House condemn it. Sir John Treleaven, the Bishop of Bangor, Dean Vaughan—men who do not hold strong political views—are agreed in condemning the action of the Government. In University and in legal circles the appointment is condemned. *The Law Times* says:—

"Lord Halsbury has appointed his brothers, his wife's relations, his friends' friends, and, occasionally those who have done service to the Party; but it never seems to have occurred to him to be necessary that a man should be a good lawyer, and have some experience at the bar in order to be a good Judge."

Similar opinions have been expressed by other legal authorities, but I rest my case upon the Resolution of the House of Lords, and I think appointments of this character, in defiance of the express order of the House of Commons, really amounts to contempt. I beg to move the Resolution standing in my name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, in the interests of the due administration of justice, and in face of the Resolution of this House of 8th March 1872, regrets the appointment to the judgeship of a County Court District in which the Welsh language is generally spoken, of a gentleman who is unable to speak or understand that language,"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*),

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

\*MR. DAVID THOMAS (Morthyr Tydvil): I desire, Sir, to second the

Motion, and I do so on precisely similar grounds to those upon which my hon. Friend based his case. I am sorry it should be necessary to dispel certain illusions which have taken hold of the mind of the people in England. It is suggested again that we are once more raising the cry of "Wales for the Welsh," and that we are endeavouring to foster the Welsh language. For my own part, I desire explicitly to repudiate that suggestion. We have no desire to raise any such cry, for that would imply a confession of our inability to compete with Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen upon equal grounds. Nor have we any desire to stimulate the Welsh language by artificial means. The Welsh language is very well able to take care of itself. But, Sir, what I wish to point out to the House is this: that the Resolution passed in 1872 refers particularly to this district to which Judge Beresford has been appointed, a district which forms one of the most Welsh parts of Wales. I do not know what the defence of the Government may be, or if they will set up any at all, but it has occurred to me that possibly this appointment was due to an oversight on their part. If they defend themselves by saying this is not a Welsh-speaking district, I would remind them that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Denbighshire raised the question in 1872 in relation to this very circuit to which Judge Beresford has been appointed. A larger number of people speak Welsh to-day than was the case in 1872, though I do not say that the proportion is larger; but, in consequence of the increase in population, the actual number is greater now than in 1872. The present Government has repeatedly recognised the necessity for appointing Welsh-speaking officials. That was done, for example, in the Factory Act and in the Mines Regulation Act. I have nothing to say against Judge Beresford. I have always heard him spoken of as an extremely fair-minded man, and until to-day I knew nothing about his connection with the Prime Minister. Upon his legal qualifications I do not feel competent to express any opinion, but I do say that the appointment of an English-speaking Judge to a Welsh-speaking district,



in the face of the Resolution of 1872. is more or less a reflection on the Welsh-speaking barristers of the North and South Wales Circuits, and on the Welsh Stipendiary Magistrates, who are of sufficient standing for the post of County Court Judge. Selections from the Stipendiary Magistrates have already been made, as in the case of Judge Bishop and Judge Gwilym Williams. If the Government are prepared to defend the appointment, I hope the House will not hesitate to express its strong condemnation of the contempt shown by the Government for the Resolution passed in 1872. That Resolution requires not merely that *ceteris paribus* preference should be given to Welsh-speaking barristers, but that a Welsh-speaking barrister shall be appointed to the Mid Wales Circuit if a competent man can be found.

\*(4.20.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): I can assure the hon. Gentlemen the Mover and the Seconder of this Amendment that I sympathise to a very great extent with what I may call the national sentiment to which they have referred in many of the observations they have made. I have not the slightest intention of saying a word in depreciation of the Welsh language, with which, unfortunately, I am not acquainted. But I confess that as this Amendment has been moved and seconded in language which suggests that a contempt of the Resolution of the House of Commons has been committed, I think it is desirable that the House should have a few facts, and should know a little more about the history of this matter. If what the hon. Gentlemen allege is a contempt of the House of Commons it is a contempt of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and many other right hon. Gentlemen who acted when the Resolution was much more recent than it is at the present time, have also been guilty. I am not going to draw distinctions between the barristers who could and who could not speak Welsh, because I have, in my present position, the privilege of knowing a great deal of the members of my profession, and I will assume the Mover and the Seconder

of this Amendment said what was perfectly right when they said that there were gentlemen at the Bar who do possess a knowledge of Welsh, and who would be well qualified to discharge the duties of a County Court Judge. But having regard to the history of this Resolution and what has happened since, I would submit to those who proposed this Amendment, that in their somewhat severe strictures upon Her Majesty's Government they rather overshot the mark. The Resolution that was passed in 1872 was passed upon a question that referred to this particular Circuit—the Mid Wales Circuit. The first appointment made after the Resolution of 1872 was in October, 1874, when one of the most honoured of the County Court Judges was appointed, and I am quite sure that than Mr. (afterwards Sir) Horatio Lloyd, there never was a more competent man who sat upon the Bench. I believe that Sir Horatio Lloyd was not able to speak Welsh, and was not able to do more than understand a very little of it. He was appointed on his merits. I know Sir Horatio Lloyd has constantly been in Welsh-speaking districts, and I am not aware of a single complaint ever having been made against him based upon the fact that he was not able to speak the Welsh language. The next appointment that was made was in January, 1878, and it was that of a very distinguished lawyer, the father of the gentleman whose name has given rise to this Amendment. I knew him intimately; and though he did not wear a silk gown, there was no more distinguished lawyer. He was constantly consulted, as I know, in cases of great importance. Parts of the circuit over which Judge Beresford presided were most unquestionably in the Welsh-speaking districts. He was there for 13 years. Mr. Beresford presided with great satisfaction over his Court for all these years. (Cries of "No, no.") Hon. Members opposite must pardon me for saying that I speak with an intimate knowledge of the profession, and I am not aware of any suggestion ever made that he was not one of the most distinguished and competent of our County Court Judges. The next appointment was in February, 1884,

*Mr. David Thomas*

me the right hon. Gentleman  
ber for Midlothian was Prime  
the right hon. Gentleman the  
for Derby was Home Secretary,  
Selborne was Lord Chancellor.  
time the Resolution of the  
of Commons was well known.  
was appointed? Why, Mr.  
Brecknockshire and Glamor-  
and he had no qualification  
as to speaking Welsh.  
t argue the merits of the case;  
know that the Government,  
as a Member of it one who  
ch a Welshman as my right  
friend opposite, made appoint-  
consistent with this Resolution.  
to me to be very strong to  
action taken some seven years  
being in contempt of that Re-

In October, 1884, Mr.  
ams was appointed by the then  
ancellor to the Circuit also  
Brecknock and parts of Gla-  
hire. In January, 1886, Mr.  
was appointed; and I call the  
of the House to the fact that  
Chancellor, who is said to be  
tuous of the Resolution, so  
d a gentleman who did speak  
sh language. In July, 1885,  
r our coming into office, Mr.  
Jones was appointed. He  
ble to speak Welsh, although  
ow a distinguished County  
dge in districts where Welsh  
is not required. I desire,  
to point out that Her  
s Government, when they  
d to decide these questions  
on the advice of the Lord  
or, have made more appoint-

Welsh-speaking Judges than  
ernment of the right hon.  
for Midlothian. I am not  
say that his Honour, Judge  
d, is a better lawyer, or better  
to sit as a County Court  
an other members of the Bar  
ircuit. In fact, I was a little  
l to hear the hon. Member  
arvon limit the number of  
ntlemen equally well qualified  
The circumstances affecting  
sford were certainly unusual.  
er was a County Court Judge  
ars in the adjoining district,  
1. He had not been in good  
aring his later years, and Mr.

Cecil Beresford had sat for him re-  
peatedly. I am doing no more than  
justice when I state that while so  
sitting as a Deputy Judge he gave  
universal satisfaction, and I do not  
believe that any professional Member  
of this House, who ever practised  
before him, will say anything to the  
contrary. And that is not all. There  
came from the district in which he had  
sat as a Judge—a district in which,  
according to the contention of the hon.  
Mover and Seconder of this Motion, a  
Welsh-speaking Judge was required—  
a very largely signed Petition asking  
for his appointment. I do not suppose  
the gentlemen who presented that Peti-  
tion were indifferent to the considera-  
tion as to a Welsh-speaking Judge, and  
I dare say they were ignorant of the  
Resolution of the House of Commons,  
which had been disregarded on five or  
six occasions before. But Mr. Beresford  
was appointed accordingly. His Honor  
Judge Bishop, who was then  
Judge of Circuit No. 28, Mid-Wales,  
was transferred to the Circuit over  
which the late Judge Beresford had  
presided, and Mr. Beresford was ap-  
pointed to No. 28. I have taken some  
pains to inform myself as to what has  
happened during the time Mr. Beresford  
has been sitting as Judge, and it is no  
exaggeration to say that when the ques-  
tion arose of his removal to another  
place, persons of all parties and all  
sections of the Press, without regard to  
politics, expressed a hope that he would  
not be removed. I think it is only  
common fairness to an absent Member  
of the Government to ask hon. Mem-  
bers to come to the conclusion that he  
fairly considered this point on its  
merits, especially as he had himself on  
two previous occasions appointed a  
gentleman who could speak Welsh,  
and I would suggest to this House  
that the idea of a contemptuous inten-  
tion to disregard the Resolution of 1872  
is an exaggeration. I do not wish to  
argue at any length the question of the  
necessity of appointing Welsh-speaking  
Judges. I am not going to suggest  
that it should not be taken into con-  
sideration; but I do know this,  
from barristers practising in these  
Courts, that repeatedly witnesses  
who are examined in Welsh answer in  
English, and also ask that questions

in the face of the Resolution of 1872, is more or less a reflection on the Welsh-speaking barristers of the North and South Wales Circuits, and on the Welsh Stipendiary Magistrates, who are of sufficient standing for the post of County Court Judge. Selections from the Stipendiary Magistrates have already been made, as in the case of Judge Bishop and Judge Gwilym Williams. If the Government are prepared to defend the appointment, I hope the House will not hesitate to express its strong condemnation of the contempt shown by the Government for the Resolution passed in 1872. That Resolution requires not merely that *ceteris paribus* preference should be given to Welsh-speaking barristers, but that a Welsh-speaking barrister shall be appointed to the Mid Wales Circuit if a competent man can be found.

\*(4.20.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): I can assure the hon. Gentlemen the Mover and the Seconder of this Amendment that I sympathise to a very great extent with what I may call the national sentiment to which they have referred in many of the observations they have made. I have not the slightest intention of saying a word in depreciation of the Welsh language, with which, unfortunately, I am not acquainted. But I confess that as this Amendment has been moved and seconded in language which suggests that a contempt of the Resolution of the House of Commons has been committed, I think it is desirable that the House should have a few facts, and should know a little more about the history of this matter. If what the hon. Gentlemen allege is a contempt of the House of Commons it is a contempt of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and many other right hon. Gentlemen who acted when the Resolution was much more recent than it is at the present time, have also been guilty. I am not going to draw distinctions between the barristers who could and who could not speak Welsh, because I have, in my present position, the privilege of knowing a great deal of the members of my profession, and I will assume the Mover and the Seconder

of this Amendment said what was perfectly right when they said that there were gentlemen at the Bar who possess a knowledge of Welsh, and would be well qualified to discharge the duties of a County Court Judge. But having regard to the history of this Resolution and what happened since, I would submit those who proposed this Amendment, that in their somewhat strictures upon Her Majesty's Government they rather overshot the mark. The Resolution that was passed in 1872 was passed upon a question that referred to this particular circuit—the Mid Wales Circuit. The first appointment made after the Resolution of 1872 was in October, 1872, when one of the most honoured of County Court Judges was appointed, and I am quite sure that than (afterwards Sir) Horatio Lloyd, there never was a more competent man to sit upon the Bench. I believe that Horatio Lloyd was not able to speak Welsh, and was not able to more than understand a very little of it. He was appointed on his merits. I know Sir Horatio Lloyd has constantly been in Welsh-speaking districts, and I am not aware of any complaint ever having been made against him based upon the fact that he was not able to speak the Welsh language. The next appointment that was made was in January, 1878, and it was of a very distinguished lawyer, the father of the gentleman whose name has given rise to this Amendment. I knew him intimately; and though he did not wear a silk gown, there was no more distinguished lawyer who was constantly consulted, as I know in cases of great importance. Part of the circuit over which Judge Balfour presided were most unquestionably in the Welsh-speaking districts. He was there for 13 years. Mr. Balfour presided with great satisfaction in his Court for all these years. (Cries: "No, no.") Hon. Members must pardon me for saying that I speak with an intimate knowledge of the profession, and I am not aware of any suggestion ever made that he was not one of the most distinguished and competent of our County Court Judges. The last appointment was in February, 1881.

*Mr. David Thomas*

at the time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian was Prime Minister, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was Home Secretary, and Lord Selborne was Lord Chancellor. At that time the Resolution of the House of Commons was well known. Yet who was appointed? Why, Mr. Owen to Brecknockshire and Glamorganshire, and he had no qualification whatever as to speaking Welsh. I will not argue the merits of the case; but we know that the Government, which had as a Member of it one who is as much a Welshman as my right hon. Friend opposite, made appointments inconsistent with this Resolution. It seems to me to be very strong to speak of action taken some seven years later as being in contempt of that Resolution. In October, 1884, Mr. G. Williams was appointed by the then Lord Chancellor to the Circuit also including Brecknock and parts of Glamorganshire. In January, 1886, Mr. Bishop was appointed; and I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Lord Chancellor, who is said to be contemptuous of the Resolution, so appointed a gentleman who did speak the Welsh language. In July, 1885, just after our coming into office, Mr. Brymnor Jones was appointed. He also is able to speak Welsh, although he is now a distinguished County Court Judge in districts where Welsh speaking is not required. I desire, further, to point out that Her Majesty's Government, when they have had to decide these questions mainly on the advice of the Lord Chancellor, have made more appointments of Welsh-speaking Judges than the Government of the right hon. Member for Midlothian. I am not here to say that his Honour, Judge Beresford, is a better lawyer, or better qualified to sit as a County Court Judge, than other members of the Bar of that Circuit. In fact, I was a little surprised to hear the hon. Member for Carnarvon limit the number of other gentlemen equally well qualified to six. The circumstances affecting Mr. Beresford were certainly unusual. His father was a County Court Judge for 13 years in the adjoining district, Circuit 31. He had not been in good health during his later years, and Mr.

Cecil Beresford had sat for him repeatedly. I am doing no more than justice when I state that while so sitting as a Deputy Judge he gave universal satisfaction, and I do not believe that any professional Member of this House, who ever practised before him, will say anything to the contrary. And that is not all. There came from the district in which he had sat as a Judge—a district in which, according to the contention of the hon. Mover and Seconder of this Motion, a Welsh-speaking Judge was required—a very largely signed Petition asking for his appointment. I do not suppose the gentlemen who presented that Petition were indifferent to the consideration as to a Welsh-speaking Judge, and I dare say they were ignorant of the Resolution of the House of Commons, which had been disregarded on five or six occasions before. But Mr. Beresford was appointed accordingly. His Honour Judge Bishop, who was then Judge of Circuit No. 28, Mid-Wales, was transferred to the Circuit over which the late Judge Beresford had presided, and Mr. Beresford was appointed to No. 28. I have taken some pains to inform myself as to what has happened during the time Mr. Beresford has been sitting as Judge, and it is no exaggeration to say that when the question arose of his removal to another place, persons of all parties and all sections of the Press, without regard to politics, expressed a hope that he would not be removed. I think it is only common fairness to an absent Member of the Government to ask hon. Members to come to the conclusion that he fairly considered this point on its merits, especially as he had himself on two previous occasions appointed a gentleman who could speak Welsh, and I would suggest to this House that the idea of a contemptuous intention to disregard the Resolution of 1872 is an exaggeration. I do not wish to argue at any length the question of the necessity of appointing Welsh-speaking Judges. I am not going to suggest that it should not be taken into consideration; but I do know this, from barristers practising in these Courts, that repeatedly witnesses who are examined in Welsh answer in English, and also ask that questions

may be put in English. I am not suggesting that there are no cases at times when knowledge of the language would be desirable, but I am referring to the general practice. I believe that for many years past every child in Wales has been taught English as well as Welsh. It is an honour to the Welsh nation that that should be so; but so far as this demand is concerned, it has been certainly decreasing in importance from 1872 down to 1891. I hope I have shown no feeling but one of sympathy with the national sentiment of Wales, for I have not the slightest intention of going in face of the Resolution of the House of Commons, or outraging the feelings of hon. Members from Wales; and I trust that those who may follow me will deal with my remarks in the same spirit as that in which I have addressed them in this House.

\*(4.45.) MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.): I must say I am very much disappointed with the explanation which the hon. and learned Gentleman has offered. The only defence he has set up for the Government of which he is a Member is, that other Governments have done the same thing; but even if that were so, two blacks do not make a white. I do not regard this as in any way a Party question, and therefore I shall put aside all he has said on that subject. Now what are the facts? Mr. Horatio Lloyd, who, I believe, was appointed under the Government of the right hon. Member for Midlothian, does not speak the Welsh language; but, if my memory serves me, he told me on the occasion of his appointment that he was able to understand what Welsh witnesses said, and to check any mistakes they made. In February, 1884, Mr. Gwyn-Owen was appointed to the post, and I should have supposed that anyone bearing that name would speak Welsh. He was very soon after transferred to another post, and Mr. Gwilym Williams, one of the best Welsh scholars, I know, was appointed to it. From that time every County Court Judge who has held that post has been perfectly competent to deal with Welsh witnesses, and to speak and understand the language. The Attorney General says that he does not wish to

argue the question of appointing Welsh-speaking Judges in Welsh-speaking districts, and I am not surprised, because the question is concluded by the Resolution of the House of Commons, which, if it means anything, means that if you can get a competent man who speaks the Welsh language, he should be appointed. The Resolution which I had the honour of bringing forward, and I am sorry to say I believe I am the only Member now left in the House of Commons who took part in the Debate on that occasion, dealt with the very circuit with which we are now dealing, and there never was a question so exhaustively debated, or a Resolution at which the House arrived with such perfect unanimity. The only shadow of objection to it was an old Statute of Henry VIII., which has since been repealed. Speaking on that occasion as the representative of the Government, my noble Friend Lord Aberdare, then Mr. Bruce, said legal fitness was, of course, always the first consideration; but he was sure, after what they had heard that night, that for the future Governments would have regard to a knowledge of Welsh in making these appointments. Are we to understand that there is a Government now in Office which has no regard to the qualification of speaking Welsh? because, if it is so, it is desirable that we should know it. I see the Home Secretary in his place, and remember the answer he gave in reply to a Motion I made as to the appointment of a Sub-Inspector, who could not speak Welsh, to a mining district in which the Welsh language was almost exclusively spoken. As soon as that appointment was made I had, as Chairman of Petty Sessions, to adjudicate upon a summons taken out by that gentleman against the lessees of the mine for a breach of the Mines Regulation Act. The prosecution broke down on other grounds, but in any case it must have broken down, because the Mining Inspector could not speak a word of Welsh, and those from whom he got his information could not speak a word of English, so that the whole of the proceedings had to be carried on in a sort of dumb show. That is not exactly the same case as this, but, at any rate, if the

*Sir Richard Webster*

right hon. Gentleman had heard it argued, he would have felt as I do, that it was wrong to appoint a gentleman to that office who could not speak the Welsh language. The hon. Gentleman the Attorney General did not put forward any kind of defence against the Motion, for he did not even suggest that a good man could not have been found who could speak Welsh. It used to be said, when complaints were made of the non-appointment of Welsh-speaking Bishops, that you could not find a Welshman competent to take the post, but that objection is now never raised, and whatever we may think of the political or other opinions of the Welsh Bishops, abler men do not sit upon the Episcopal Bench. What I want to impress upon the hon. and learned Gentleman is the fact that it is not only important that we should have men who will administer justice duly, but that the people before whom they administer it should be perfectly confident that it is so administered; and unless you have a man who is familiar with the Welsh people and the Welsh language, it is perfectly impossible that such a feeling of confidence can be created. I do not think it necessary to argue the question any further, for it is really concluded by the Resolution, and as long as it stands on the Order Book of this House, to treat it as my hon. and learned Friend has just done is to treat it as if it were nothing better than waste paper. If the answer we have heard from him is all the Government can give, I sincerely trust that my hon. Friend will persevere with his Motion, and I shall be very happy to support it.

(4.55.) **SIR J. PULESTON** (Devonport): I have never wavered in my contention in favour of the principle of the Motion now moved by the hon. Member opposite, and on more than one occasion, when the question has been raised during the nearly 19 years in which I have been in this House, I have always taken exactly the same position as I do now, namely, that a Welsh-speaking barrister should always be appointed to a County Court Judgeship in the Principality. The right hon. Gentleman opposite found it convenient, in view of the facts presented by the Attorney General, to say

this was not a Party question; but he will not hesitate to call it a Party question directly he gets outside this House, and he will take very good care not to explain his want of Welsh patriotism in failing to call attention to this question within a few years after the passing of his own Resolution. He passed over, in solemn silence, jobs committed by the Government of which he was himself a Member. Reference has been made to the case of Mr. Brynnor Jones. It was generally understood that there was no more brilliant man at the Bar, but when he was appointed it so happened he had just been defeated as the Liberal candidate for Mid Glamorgan.

**MR. S. EVANS:** Mr. Jones never was a candidate for that constituency.

**SIR J. PULESTON:** He was a well-known politician, and while I apologise very gladly for what I have said, I may explain that he was, at all events, mentioned in the papers as a possible candidate. I do not defend this appointment of Mr. Beresford. On the contrary, I condemn it in the strongest possible manner, and I shall vote gladly in favour of the Resolution; but I think that the Lord Chancellor probably did not have in his mind the Resolution of the House of Commons, and did have regard to precedents set by former Liberal Governments. He had other reasons, however, to suppose that the appointment of Mr. Beresford would be acceptable in Wales, for a memorial was presented which I believe was signed by an hon. Member opposite.

**MR. S. EVANS:** I did not sign the memorial, and I refused to do so.

**SIR J. PULESTON:** My authority is a paper published in his own part of Wales, and I regret that I have been misled into that statement. I do not admit that such circumstances ever occur that there is not one Welshman to be found in eight or ten years fitted to occupy the position of County Court Judge. I do not know how many applicants there were for this post, but I know several men eminent at the Bar and thoroughly conversant with the Welsh language—including a Member of this House—who would have adorned the position. I agree that what has been said does not suggest

that Mr. Beresford had not the proper legal qualifications for the post, and I regret that the hon. Member, after stating that, should have thought it necessary to read an extract from a letter to the *Law Times* condemnatory of his qualification. I hope, now that the question has been again so prominently brought forward, no appointments will in future be made in contravention of the Resolution passed in 1872. Apart from the question of the Welsh language, which is a very serious matter, we claim that we have a sentimental right to have Welshmen in Welsh places, especially as a knowledge of Welsh is essential to the right administration of justice in peculiarly Welsh districts. It is impossible to administer justice with equity through the medium of an interpreter; we know the difficulty in our own English Courts. I trust that, in future, no Lord Chancellor of any Party will venture to disregard the national aspirations and national feelings of justice and right which is attached to the appointment of Welsh County Court Judges.

(5.5.) MR. BOWEN ROWLANDS (Cardiganshire): I only desire, Sir, to say a few words on the observations which fell from the Attorney General, and first, as usual, I am bound to congratulate him upon the admirable tone and temper in which he dealt with the question. I did not expect anything else, but I was surprised at the weakness of the case he made out. He confessed that a knowledge of Welsh is an important element to consider in making the appointment of County Court Judges; then, I ask, what peculiar characteristics are there in the person now holding the post which led to that important element being disregarded in this case? I ask this the more because, though I have the honour of being acquainted with Judge Beresford, I am acquainted with barristers who are conversant with the Welsh language, and eminently qualified to adorn the position. What are the distinguishing characteristics which led to the appointment of Mr. Beresford in disregard of this admittedly important qualification, instead of others whom the Attorney General admits were capable, as capable, of

performing the duties of the office? I think the Attorney General surrenders the whole case when he admits that there were others qualified to fulfil the duties, unless some supporter of the Government gets up and points out some distinguishing characteristics in the case. Names of other Judges have been mentioned as those of men well worthy of respect. Sir Horatio Lloyd was mentioned. He was a worthy and competent Judge, but he understood Welsh enough to check witnesses, and was imbued with a thorough knowledge of Welsh life, so that he could follow the reasoning of witnesses in describing their conduct on particular occasions. All his case proves, if he were not, that some man of great ability and special qualification may be so fitted for a post as to be able to surmount the great objection of want of knowledge of the language. There is another Judge, Mr. Stevenson Owen, County Court Judge for Cardiff. The Attorney General said that he was Judge for the district of Brecknockshire and part of Glamorganshire. That is somewhat misleading. The most important part of his work is done in the English-speaking Courts of Cardiff and Newport, though he is also Judge of some small part of Brecknock. The Attorney General spoke of a memorial in Judge Beresford's favour. I do not think such memorials are to be preferred to the popular election of Judges, to which hon. Gentlemen opposite have such an objection. The right hon. Gentleman said that when it was proposed to remove him, every section of politics and school of thought united in his favour. I should like to ask, why was it proposed to remove him, unless in obedience to a large national demand for his removal? I can hardly conceive it entering into the head of the Government, unless their conscience pricked them—

SIR RICHARD WEBSTER: I said I understood that, in consequence of some correspondence as to his not speaking Welsh, a paragraph appeared in a paper to the effect that he was going to be removed, and that paragraph was repeated for some weeks.

MR. B. ROWLANDS: I thought he said it was proposed to remove Judge Beresford. I understand now that there was a tumult or excite

ment in the country, which was shown by a large number of letters in newspapers, and articles pointing out that he was not so distinguished in other respects as to justify his being made an exception to the rule laid down so many years ago, which the Attorney General admits is very applicable to cases analogous to the present one. That there was this feeling—not against Mr. Beresford personally—is undeniable; there was a unanimous chorus of disapprobation of the appointment which was supposed, rightly or wrongly, not to be the work of the Lord Chancellor, who from his connection with Wales would have been desirous to do what was right and proper; it was supposed to be the result of some powerful motive with which the Lord Chancellor had no personal or immediate concern. If there were no particular motive, what was the reason of the appointment? Was it that his father had previously held the post of County Court Judge? The Attorney General referred to witnesses who spoke English. I do not quite understand the purport of it. He said that some witnesses about to speak in Welsh, the interpreter being sworn, answered in English instead. I have known great wrong to have been done in consequence of witnesses having been forced to speak in English who ought to have been allowed to speak in Welsh. They were able to understand the ordinary language of the oath in English, but were unable to follow the intricacies of a subtle argument, into which they were led by a skilful person. One of these Courts is in the county I represent, and I honestly believe, from my knowledge of these and other places, that a knowledge of Welsh is a very desirable thing. No one suggests that a knowledge of Welsh is to be so preferentially considered that eminent legal and other qualifications are to be deferred to it, but there is no claim of superior qualification in this case. The Attorney General says that one benefit of the Debate will be that the Resolution of 1872 will be brought into greater prominence, but he says the Government had taken it into consideration already. If these facts—the circumstances of the locality and the Resolution—had been committed to the hon. and learned Gentleman, he would, I am

certain, have appointed a person satisfactory to the Welsh people in regard to his knowledge of Welsh. The Government have disregarded a Resolution passed by the House of Commons, and whether it be called contempt or disregard is a mere question of words. This gentleman was appointed to the dissatisfaction of the Welsh people, who expressed their feeling in every constitutional way, and they now speak through their Representatives and some who desire in the future to represent them, and the hon. Gentleman opposite found himself so placed that he was bound to rise and join in the unanimous denunciation.

SIR J. PULESTON: I particularly called attention to the fact that long ago, before the question was present to the mind of the hon. Gentleman, I had spoken in this House and elsewhere as strongly on it as I have spoken to-night.

MR. B. ROWLANDS: That is what I meant to say; he is able conscientiously, in accordance with his feelings, to join us in repeating his condemnation to which he has so patriotically given voice on other occasions, and which I cordially agree with.

(5.20.) MR. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.): I hold somewhat strong opinions on the Welsh language, especially in regard to its use and influence in Wales, but I hope not so much as to bias my judgment on this point. If we were to consider the Welsh language in all its bearings in this respect I am afraid some of us who represent Welsh constituencies might not occupy the positions that we do. When the question was raised some years ago I could only find one hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for Merionethshire, who was capable of speaking Welsh. I do not, however, carry my loved Welsh to a ridiculous point. I am a lawyer myself, but, having never practised, I should like to look at this question quite apart from its legal aspect. It seems to me that this Resolution, passed in 1872, stands upon its own merits. It was proposed by a Welshman on one side of the House and accepted by a typical Welshman on the other side; but since it was passed, Governments, whether from this side or that, have refused to acknowledge the force of it. My knowledge



of Welshmen is sufficient to enable me to say how deeply it touches the Welsh people that, in matters connected with their official arrangements, in matters where their real interests are concerned, where evidence is tendered in the Welsh language, the officials are not able to understand it. Surely, Sir, the spirit of the Resolution meant that, where possible, Welsh Judges were to be appointed. Now that the question has been brought up, I think we may fairly ask the Government to give us a further promise that the spirit of the Resolution shall be acted on honestly and in the full sense, and every sense, of the word. I have had some little experience of the smaller Courts, and I can honestly say this: that it has been a great trouble to me that I have not been able to master the Welsh language. I would venture to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether something more positive than a mere reiteration of his promise can be given to us, and whether in the future we may congratulate ourselves that, in the interests of the administration of justice in Wales, those difficulties which have hitherto attended it in the Principality, and of which we complain, shall be removed, and that fair-play will be given to the Members of the Principality, independent of politics or creed.

(5.35.) MR. ABEL THOMAS (Cardmarthen, E.): I think it is impossible for the Attorney General to maintain that the appointment to which the Resolution refers was made upon its merits, having regard to the choice the Lord Chancellor had at the time of several other gentlemen of large practice at the Bar, and of large experience, who could speak and understand the Welsh language. I think I can say with accuracy that I have had as great experience in Mid Wales and some of those districts just referred to as most other people. I know the whole of the district, and I know the gentlemen whose names the Attorney General read out, and all the facts connected with their appointment. Those appointments by no means meet the point in dispute, and it is therefore no answer to the case put forward by the Welsh Members to-night. Sir Horatio Lloyd was a man of very large practice. Mr. Judge Beresford, although it was a mistake to

*Mr. Kenyon*

have appointed him to a Welsh district still would have made a most excellent Judge if appointed to England. I cannot understand why he should be sent into Cardiganshire, where he would have Welsh witnesses before him. But he was a good man at the same time. The next appointment to which the Attorney General referred was that of Mr. Gwynne Owen, who, it is true, was appointed by a Liberal Government. He was a Welshman, and a well-known Welshman—but neither speaking nor understanding Welsh—and he was removed from Mid Wales to an English-speaking district. He was a most excellent Judge. There was a large settlement of English-speaking people in and around the district, and the fact that he was removed to it from Wales because he was unable to speak Welsh shows the force of the case we are now complaining of. The next appointment was that of Mr. Gwilym Williams. He speaks Welsh very well. The next is Mr. Judge Bishop, who was appointed for Mid Wales, and who speaks Welsh very well; I have heard him many times, and he both understands and speaks it. The next was Mr. Brynmor Jones, who was appointed to Mid Wales, but who was removed to another district. These were the appointments to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, and I say it is no answer to the case. I know the circuit well, and I could point to many names of men, some of them of longer experience, and some of infinitely greater worth at the Bar than Mr. Cecil Beresford; three of these were of greater ability and could speak Welsh, and they were passed over for a man who could not speak Welsh. Having had before them the Resolution of the House, that in Welsh-speaking districts like Mid Wales gentlemen who had a knowledge of the Welsh language should be appointed, if possible, for County Court Judgeships, I say it is absurd to contend that the appointment of Judge Beresford was made upon its merits. It has been said that there were petitions presented in favour of the appointment of that gentleman. Are we going to appoint our Judges upon petitions? Surely that is no proper reason for the selection, seeing how easily

petitions can be got up upon one side or the other, and I am surprised that petitions should be put forward as a justification of the appointment. Just imagine a man who is seeking for an appointment as a County Court Judge having to rely upon a round-robin in his favour, or having to rely upon petitions in order to get the Lord Chancellor to give him the appointment. Why, we all know how easy it is to get up such petitions. It has been stated by the Attorney General that the appointment has been received with acclamation, and that it has been regarded by the public with favour, but he did not go to the proper quarter for evidence of this.

SIR RICHARD WEBSTER: I stated that I had it from all sections and parties, and from quotations from public newspapers.

MR. ABEL THOMAS: I suppose he has had copies of newspapers sent him, but that is not the way to arrive at what is the public sentiment. Mere statements in Party newspapers go for little in such matters. Nor is it conclusive when a certain number of gentlemen practising in Mr. Judge Beresford's Court sign a document stating that they believe it to be a most excellent appointment. Let the hon. and learned Gentleman go to the poor whose cases are to be tried in Court. The vast majority of cases are generally only relating to small debts of a few shillings, and most of the suitors speak only Welsh, and have to rely upon the Court interpreter provided for them. It is in such cases that injustice is done; not in big cases, where solicitors can be employed who understand the case. In Cardiff and in other large and populous centres, where those heavy actions are tried, there may be little injustice in having a Judge who is not acquainted with the Welsh language; but in small places in the Welsh-speaking district, where poor men go into Court, it is of the greatest importance to have a Judge who speaks and understands the language. I have seen injustice done over and over again in consequence of the Judge's ignorance of Welsh. It is done inadvertently; he tries to do his best. Take the interpreter. He generally is an educated man, and yet you have the solicitor

correcting him over and over again because of the fact that the idioms of the languages are so different. Such a Court is that to which Judge Beresford was appointed. I say if you are going to appoint County Court Judges because of the fact that they sit for their father, you are not likely to find the right man. The Lord Chancellor must have known of his own knowledge the South Western Circuit of Cardiff, and he must have known that there are men of much larger business and experience than Mr. Beresford at the Bar who would have thoroughly understood the language and been popular with the people if any one of them had been selected. If it were a matter of politics these were men who were known to be Conservatives, and not Liberals. I say this was not an appointment on its merits, and I hope the House will show that it is not going to permit a definite Resolution passed by it to be set aside without any decent pretext, and that the House will accept the Motion.

(5.45.) MR. H. T. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN (Kent, Faversham): As an independent supporter of Her Majesty's Government I regret I cannot upon this occasion go into the Lobby with them. I feel it to be my duty to vote with the hon. Members opposite in case of a Division being taken. I had confidently hoped that the Government would have been able to say that the reason why they did not appoint a gentleman who was able to speak Welsh was because they could not find any member of the Bar having that as well as the other necessary qualifications. But the Attorney General did not take that ground of defence. It was not suggested that there were not such gentlemen; the only defence was that the Liberal Lord Chancellor had also disregarded the Resolution of 1872. Now, two wrongs do not make a right—and that is no defence at all. Having regard to the Resolution of 1872, which I think is more required at present than when it was passed, and looking at the case as put by the other side, and the way it has been answered, I shall feel it my duty to vote against the Government.

(5.50.) MR. SAMUEL T. EVANS (Glamorgan, Mid.): I think it is observable, and everyone who has spoken, with the single exception of the Attorney General, has spoken against the conduct of the Lord Chancellor. It is a curious fact that we are discussing an appointment of a County Court Judge to the very Circuit in reference to which this Resolution of 1872 was passed. Nobody has been able to deny that this is a Welsh district, that the vast majority of the people speak Welsh, and Welsh only; and that it is, therefore, a district which came within the Resolution. There are also many barristers on the Welsh Circuits who could speak the language, who are otherwise qualified. Let me say that we are not attacking the Government upon this matter. The appointment was made by the Lord Chancellor, and it is his conduct we challenge. The Attorney General seemed to take it for granted that the Lord Chancellor did not act in forgetfulness of this Resolution, and one hon. Gentleman told us that the Lord Chancellor did not have this Resolution in his mind.

SIR J. PULESTON: I said that I assumed he had not; I had no authority.

MR. S. EVANS: I so understood the hon. Member. We may now take it for granted that the Government is the keeper of the Lord Chancellor's conscience. In regard to the defence of the Attorney General, it appears to me to be this: that Mr. Cecil Beresford was appointed by the Lord Chancellor, who knew that he had not a knowledge of the Welsh language, who knew that it was a Welsh-speaking district, and who knew that there were other men on the Circuit well qualified. I think the whole defence of the Lord Chancellor has crumbled into atoms. As for Mr. Beresford's merits—

SIR RICHARD WEBSTER: I said I would not discuss the merits of Mr. Beresford; but my refusal must not be taken to indicate that the gentleman was not considered to be the best candidate for the appointment.

MR. S. EVANS: We hear it now for the first time that those applicants for the post who could speak Welsh were not well qualified in other respects.

SIR RICHARD WEBSTER: So well qualified.

MR. S. EVANS: I venture to affirm that they are. I have had the honour of practising before Mr. Cecil Beresford, and although I do not say he is unfit to discharge the duties of a County Court Judge, I will answer without hesitation that there are other men attached to the Welsh Bar who speak Welsh, and who are quite as well qualified as he from a legal point of view. It might be interesting to know that when County Courts were first established in Wales the Judges were most perfectly conversant with the Welsh language. If we only brought this matter on for the first time to-day, we should have an abundantly strong case, but we have the Resolution of the House to further strengthen it. This is a Resolution of the House of Commons; the Lord Chancellor is the Speaker of the House of Lords, and if we have any respect for ourselves at all as a Democratic Assembly we will express the sense of the House at the Lord Chancellor in another House conducting himself in such a way as to disregard the Resolution of this House. The Attorney General has expressed his sympathy with Welsh national sentiments; but we should be much more thankful if he practically illustrates it by going into the Lobby in support of the Resolution, as there is little us expressing sympathy with national sentiments and then disregarding them.

(5.55.) MR. CHARLES J. DARRINGTON (Deptford): It appears that not only are Members prompted by a desire to abuse the County Court Judge for Mid Wales, but that they are prompted by a desire to attack the Lord Chancellor; that they desire this Democratic Assembly to pass a Resolution because it will come an opportunity to inflict some injury, some stigma, some insult upon him as Speaker of the House of Lords. How is the Lord Chancellor to meet this? He is not able to come to this House, fortunately, perhaps, for some Members. But it has been shown by the Attorney General that since the Resolution was passed appointments of a similar character have been made by the other side. I understood the Attorney General to say

that the Lord Chancellor had not this Resolution present to his mind. ("No.") I understood him to say so. I understood him to say that the Lord Chancellor had forgotten it when appointing Mr. Beresford, as Lord Selborne had forgotten it when he appointed Mr. Owen, a gentleman who could not speak Welsh, but had only a somewhat Welsh name. Nor is this forgetfulness to be wondered at, having regard to the number of Resolutions of this House. I admit that it is not likely that any appointment to a Welsh Judgeship will be made in the future by Lord Halsbury without some regard being paid to this Resolution. What may be done when a Liberal Government comes into Office I can only judge of by the case of Mr. Owen. It seems to me that the matter might be allowed to drop, because no good can be done by the passing of this Resolution more than has been done already. That being so, I have no difficulty in voting against it.

\* (6.4.) MR. ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorgan, E.): I have to say that I believe it is almost impossible that justice can be done under any other circumstances than those indicated in the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Carnarvon. I heard of a very remarkable case that occurred some months ago in the Court in which Judge Gwilym Williams sits. I wrote to Judge Williams and asked him to give me the particulars of the case; and with the permission of the House I will read his reply:—

"Miskin Manor, Pontyclun,  
"February 18th, 1892.

"Dear Mr. Thomas,—The case, I think, to which you refer is that of a man who had failed to make himself understood to the Registrar, and on whom an order was made and a judgment summons issued, and on this being heard before me I discovered his utter ignorance of English, and that he was not indebted to his creditor, the result being that I struck out the case. I am of opinion that the mistake arose from the man's ignorance of English, and my knowledge of Welsh prevented a further miscarriage of justice."

I consider that a very strong case indeed, and no comment is needed upon it. I have also known similar cases of the miscarriage of justice in the Criminal Courts. I know one case where a man was tried for murder, and was sentenced to the extreme penalty

of the law. The man did not know that he was sentenced to death until the gaoler who was putting him into the cells explained to him in Welsh that sentence of death had been passed upon him. I have heard a great deal in this Debate regarding appointments. I have no wish—I disclaim any desire—to cast any aspersion on His Honor Judge Beresford. Except that he does not speak the Welsh language, I believe he is a most excellent Judge. But with regard to the appointment, I am sorry that the Lord Chancellor did not follow the precedent which occurred with regard to the appointment of Judge Gwilym Williams. There never was an appointment made to a County Court judgeship in Wales that was more popular than that of Judge Gwilym Williams, who was promoted from being a Stipendiary Magistrate. I regret that the precedent has not been followed in the case of Judge Beresford, and that the Stipendiary Magistrate who succeeded Judge Gwilym Williams has not been appointed, or another Stipendiary Magistrate, the Stipendiary Magistrate for Cardiff, who, I believe, would have been equally qualified to fill the position. Let me say, in conclusion, that I heartily hope that some good will come of the present Debate, and that gentlemen will be appointed in future who can be reasonably expected to do justice to this position.

(6.7.) MR. DAVID RANDELL (Glamorganshire, Gower): In rising to support this Motion I have no desire to say anything against Judge Beresford. On the contrary; from my experience of him he seems extremely courteous to suitors and gentlemen practising in his Court; and he shows consideration for the disabilities of Welsh witnesses in allowing their evidence to be interpreted. But the very anxiety and solicitude shown by the late Judge Beresford in getting the evidence of Welsh witnesses interpreted into English seems to me to be the strongest argument in favour of this Motion and the appointment of Welsh-speaking Judges. I have often heard the late Judge Beresford defend Welsh witnesses from unjust attacks made upon them in reference to the allegation of perjury. Indeed, the Judge has himself many times in his Court alluded to the difficulty of Welsh witnesses in making

themselves properly understood. I would wish to call attention to the fact that gentlemen, when appointed to judicial posts in India, are supposed to possess the indispensable qualification of a knowledge of the language of the native population; and if that is a precedent that has been established in this House in reference to appointments in India, surely that qualification ought to be indispensable in relation to judicial appointments nearer home—namely, in the Principality. I think, myself, that it is a somewhat humiliating position for Judges in County Courts in Wales to occupy; to be helplessly in the hands of Welsh witnesses, and oftentimes ignorant interpreters. I am of opinion, having had considerable experience in County Courts in Welsh districts, that it is absolutely necessary to appoint Judges conversant with the Welsh language. On personal grounds I wish to say that I would have much preferred that this discussion had arisen on another appointment; but, on general and public grounds, I must unhesitatingly, and without any qualification, vote for the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Carnarvon, and I trust it will have support from all sides of the House.

(6.10.) MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorgan, Rhondda): It needs no apology on the part of the Welsh Members to call the attention of the House and the Government to the important question of the necessity of giving due recognition and consideration to a knowledge of the Welsh language in the case of judicial appointments. The present Government, I hope, will not think that all the Welsh Members here are attacking them on this question. Unfortunately for Wales, the previous Government have been guilty of the same thing. I quite agree with the Attorney General that the question should not be made a Party question. It is not a Party question, and I am very glad to find that there are Conservatives, inside and outside of this House, that have raised the question above Party considerations, and pride themselves on defending their own language, the language of their Mother Country, and the necessity thereof, especially in all judicial appointments, in Wales. More

*Mr. David Ranellid*

than that, I believe that a number of the right hon. Gentlemen who are sitting on that Front Bench this afternoon, if we were to know their inner thoughts, their heart of hearts—that they are in full sympathy with us on this question—and that they are compelled to be there to defend the bungling and stupidity of the Lord Chancellor. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary has already recognised this necessity for Wales in a less important question than this one. I believe there are other gentlemen who are quite as ready to give us proper recognition in this matter. I am very glad to find that there is such a unanimity of opinion on this question outside of the House as well as inside of the House. I should like to call attention to the fact that this district is one of the most essentially Welsh districts in the Principality. Mid-Wales County Court district extends along the west coast of Wales from Aberystwith to Pwllheli, including large portions of the Counties of Cardigan, Merioneth, and Carnarvon, where Welsh is the only language which the inhabitants easily understand. To say that His Honor Judge Beresford was able to conduct the business of his Court in another district which was an industrial district, and where English is largely spoken, is no justification whatever for his removal to another district which is essentially a Welsh-speaking district. I think a great mistake has been made, and I would call the attention of the Attorney General to this fact. This is not a Party question. It is a national question, and I am very glad to be able to inform this House that there is such a unanimity of opinion among typical Welshmen outside this House as well as inside this House as there never was upon any other question before. I should like to refer, among others, to a great number of letters which have been written to the *South Wales Star* condemning this appointment, and, in fact, bearing upon the general principle. I should like to read a brief letter from Sir John T. Llewelyn, Bart. He says that—

"In consequence of my absence from home I have not received the *South Wales Star*, which you tell me you sent. I have, however, received your letter of the 23rd this morning;

and in answer to your question, I beg to say I have always considered a knowledge of the Welsh language desirable as a qualification for legal and some other public appointments in the Welsh-speaking parts of Wales."

There are others representing the other side—from Sir William Thomas Lewis, a gentleman well-known in Wales for his ability, who has been appointed upon at least four Royal Commissions, and is now a member of three Royal Commissions; from Sir John M. Stingin, and Mr. Lewis Morris. All these gentlemen hold different political opinions, still they are unanimous upon this necessity. In this House you have a wonderful combination. Imagine for a moment; just think of it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Denbigh shire (Mr. Osborne Morgan), a Gladstonian Liberal; then you have another, the hon. Member for West Denbigh (Colonel W. Cornwallis West), a Liberal Unionist; and the hon. Member for Denbigh Boroughs (Hon. George T. Kenyon), a Conservative. All these gentlemen are at one on this question. Take another group; you have the hon. Baronet the Member for Swansea District (Sir H. Hussey Vivian), representing Wales that was, with no professed knowledge of the Welsh language. You have the hon. Baronet the Member for Devonport (Sir John Henry Puleston), representing Wales that is, with a smattering of the Welsh language, but not quite sufficient for the continuity of Welsh arguments nor conversation. You have another; he is not a Baronet by title, but he is a true Welsh Baronet, the Member for Merioneth (Mr. Thomas Edward Ellis). He is a son of the land; he is able to speak the language perfectly, and makes no mistake about his letters. Here, again, you have three gentlemen, and these three are at one upon this question. You may go over Wales in this way, finding them in triplets here and there, and find them all at one upon this question. Allow me to say again, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a Party question, nor is it a question of a religious sect nor of religious creeds. I have a letter upon this very appointment, in the *South Wales Star*, from the Very Rev. the Dean of Llandaff (the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan), in which he says—

"Sir,—The general principle can scarcely be gainsaid, and it is desirable that the Law should be administered, as well as the Gospel preached, by those who understand the language of the people. What practical difficulties may beset this application of the principle to particular cases I am scarcely competent to say."

I have another letter from Principal F. C. Edwards, D.D., Bala College, in which he says—

"Dear Sir,—I agree with you that a knowledge of Welsh is an essential qualification in any person, however eminent he may be, for legal and other public appointments in the Welsh-speaking parts of Wales. It is now practically acknowledged in ecclesiastical appointments. It is notorious that injustice is often unwittingly done in a Court of Law, because the jury understand neither counsel nor Judge. This accounts, in a measure, for the tendency of a Welsh jury to acquit the prisoner against the evidence or the Judge's summing up. I take exception only to the implied inference that every appointment of a Judge who does not know Welsh is a job. It may or may not be. My belief is, that those who make such appointments do not know the hardship they inflict upon the Welsh people generally. For this reason I thank you for raising the question and eliciting opinions upon it."

They all agree upon this question. It may be said of Wales on this question, that they have the Radicals and the Nonconformists on one hand, the Conservatives and the Churchmen upon the other hand—the lions and the lambs of Wales all lying down together, and led by my young friend, the Member for Carnarvon. They are perfectly unanimous upon the point; but I believe that the question is a question of justice and a question of necessity. I am not a lawyer, but fortunately I have a number of legal friends around me. I have been told that there is a maxim of law that a man should be tried by his peers, and I am told, also, that this is carried out as a general rule almost everywhere but in Wales. Why should the monoglot Welshman be placed at a disadvantage that no other member of the British Empire, that belongs to a distinct nationality having a language of its own, is placed at? In fact, Wales ought to be considered by England as the nearest of kin, as it were in a sense the loveliest, nay, I would almost say the best of her children. I claim that the relationship of England with Wales is closer than any other part of the United Kingdom. You cannot have a King in England without his being first

a Prince of Wales. Why, then, should Wales be treated in such an exceptional way as it is—to have its national rights disregarded by this or any other Government? I do not think that any lawyer in the House would for a moment question the ability of the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General as a lawyer to sit upon Welsh questions. But supposing for a moment that this House was a County Court, and the right hon. Gentleman presided in that Court, and that I, a Welshman, appeared before him, and could not understand exactly what was going on, and supposing I would say “Mae'r Achos i'm erbyn yn hollol annheg Siaradwch Gymraeg—parablwch eich geirian—Bhowch i'm chwaren-teg,” what would he say? With all his knowledge of the law, and with all the kindness of his heart, he would be still unable to do me justice. Therefore, if that would be the case between him and me, what would it be between a Welshman and a gentleman who could not understand Welsh in the same position? That is the real difficulty; and, at all events, I have this opinion of the great English nation, that if they could for a moment substantiate those difficulties they would remove them at once, that they would do everything in their power to remove them. My position as a miner has given me occasion oftentimes to appear in Courts with some of my legal friends defending the cases of workmen, and I could point to a number of special occasions where, by the kindness of the Judge, I was allowed to interfere between Englishmen and Welshmen. I remember a case where an English employer, who did not understand the language of his workman, shouted out in Court that the man was perjuring himself; and the Judge, who was not a Welshman, but a kind-hearted man, of himself would have had no power to question this man had it not been for the fact that there was a Welshman in Court. Although I had no standing there, still I stood up in the Court, begged pardon of the Judge, and asked to be allowed to state the case. Again and again have I jumped up in Court and begged pardon of the Judge, and asked to be allowed to explain to him. When the case was explained to him, not only did the Judge declare

*Mr. William Abraham*

that the man was right, but the manager would say the same thing. I could cite many instances of that kind, but I will only say that I have confidence that the Leader of the House will help us in this matter.

MR. J. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): Sir, I should have thought that the attention of the Attorney General having been drawn to this matter, the hon. and learned Gentleman would have sought the earliest opportunity of repairing the mistake he has made. The Attorney General has not been instructed to do anything of the kind. That being so, I can only say that if this gentleman is left to administer justice or injustice, and half of his Circuit is in the division which I represent, then, as opportunities will arise every Session on the County Court Vote for the discussion of his salary, this Government and succeeding Governments will not hear an end of the matter until the grievance of which we complain is removed.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Sir, I think everybody who has heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Rhondda Valley will have listened to it with very great sympathy, and certainly, so far as I am personally concerned, I may tell the hon. Gentleman that I heard it with a very large measure of agreement. The hon. Gentleman had two points in view in his speech. One was, if I may say so, the sentimental or national point of view; the other was the practical and legal point of view that arises when a Judge who presides in a Court does not understand the language of those who are called before him. With regard to the first point—the national point—I can assure the hon. Gentleman that I believe all the Judges in the County Courts of Wales who have been appointed for many years past have been Welshmen; and although, unfortunately, it is true that many of them do not understand the Welsh language, it has never occurred to the present Government, or to any of their predecessors, so far as I know, to do anything in the disposal of their Welsh patronage which could by any possibility hurt the feelings of even the most sensitive of the hon. Gentleman's fellow-country-

men. With regard to the most important issue raised by the hon. Gentleman and those who preceded him in Debate—the point connected with the language spoken by the County Court Judges—I would lay down a general proposition. I entirely agree with every single word that has been said as to its being an enormous advantage, other things being equal, that the Judge who presides over a Court should understand the language of every person called before him, whether as litigant or witness. And, Sir, I do not think that the Lord Chancellor or any of his predecessors have ever taken any other view, though perhaps the terms of the Resolution of twenty years ago may not always have been present in full strength in their minds. But while concurring in that general proposition, we cannot deduce from it that every County Court Judge who is to be appointed in Wales should be a gentleman speaking the Welsh language. If hon. Members will look back to the Debate of twenty years ago, in a House of very different complexion and composition, elected by a very different constituency, they will see that the Government of the day, headed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, did not accept the Amendment or Resolution in the terms in which it was put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Denbighshire. On the contrary, they thought it necessary to add qualifying words, which were inserted obviously for the purpose of allowing the Lord Chancellor, if he thought the interests of justice or the interests of local administration required it, to appoint other than Welsh-speaking Judges. How has that Resolution been interpreted by successive Governments? Of course, I am not mentioning this point for the purpose of raising Party strife, or for the purpose of making comparisons between the merits or demerits of the various Parties. I think that, with perhaps one exception, we have avoided anything in the nature of Party recrimination in this Debate, and I am the last man to desire to introduce it. I only draw attention to this fact: that of all the Judges appointed by the very eminent men of both Parties who have filled the office

of Lord Chancellor since 1872, only two, or possibly three, gentlemen have been appointed who actually spoke Welsh with facility, and decidedly the larger number, though Welshmen, were not acquainted with the Welsh tongue. The reason of this is that, rightly or wrongly—very likely wrongly; I do not pretend to prejudge the matter—the various Lord Chancellors in question conceived that though there were real objections to appointing a man who did not know Welsh, those objections were outweighed by the other qualifications possessed by the candidate. And I conceive that some such licence of judgment must be left to the Lord Chancellor, unless you are going to circumscribe, much more than was done in the Resolution passed by the House in 1872, the area within which there must be a Welsh-speaking Judge. The Circuit which is in question to-day, as in 1872, is, I am informed, the most Welsh-speaking Circuit. Yet I apprehend that even in that Circuit a very large proportion of the inhabitants know English as well as Welsh. I daresay the larger number know Welsh; many of course do not know Welsh, and a very large proportion know English as well as Welsh. I am informed that while Aberystwith is no doubt the centre of a very large Welsh-speaking population, that even there probably the majority of the inhabitants speak English as well as Welsh; whilst the important districts of Newtown and Welshpool are both very broadly composed of English-speaking rather than Welsh-speaking people; whilst that same district includes Radnorshire, which is, I am informed, an almost entirely English-speaking county, and part of Herefordshire, which is not only an English-speaking county, but is actually in England. Even in this most Welsh-speaking district there is an enormous population which is well served by the English County Court. Now, Sir, though Welsh is largely spoken in that Circuit, you would do a great injury to the purely English-speaking population if you limited every Lord Chancellor, under every circumstance of the case, to choose a Judge not from the relatively enormous number of members of the English Bar as a whole, but from the relatively restricted number of those



who were Welshmen, and who are not only Welshmen, but speak Welsh. I am not suggesting for a moment that you may not find suitable men who can speak Welsh; but I say that, so far as the English inhabitants are concerned, if you lay down a rigid rule that a Lord Chancellor is to be bound to make his selection not from the English Bar as a whole, but from that practically small fraction acquainted with the Welsh tongue, then, to begin with, some inquiry should be held in order to mark out that area where the number of Welsh-speaking inhabitants is so great that a practical injustice would accrue to them from the appointment of an English-speaking Judge. It has not been maintained by a single speaker on the other side that Judge Beresford is not fitted for his office, or that he has not shown himself absolutely adequate to perform his duties. (Opposition cries of "No, no.") I do not wish to press the point too far; but, from all the information which has reached me, I am disposed to believe that Judge Beresford, who has already had experience as a County Court Judge in a part of Wales where Welsh is largely spoken, has given satisfaction. If the House were to adopt the Resolution it would be not merely a reflection upon the Lord Chancellor, but upon a gentleman who has for many years been carrying out the duties of a County Court Judge adequately in the past, and who is likely to do so efficiently in the future. That is surely a step we should not take. It can do no possible good. I should be perfectly ready to assent to any reasonable plan, if one can be proposed, for the delimitation of the Welsh-speaking area, so that in those districts where the Welsh language predominates it should be obligatory to appoint a Welsh-speaking Judge. So long, however, as you do not make that delimitation, you must allow licence to the Lord Chancellor; and by re-affirming the Resolution of 1872 and carrying this Amendment we shall do nothing to strengthen the Resolution already passed by the House of Commons. The Government fully agree and adhere to the terms of the Resolution of 1872, and our views of the importance of that Resolution have been strengthened by the Debate

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

that has occurred. I can assure the House that a note will be taken of all that has been said this evening, and if it falls to the Government again to deal with the question of legal patronage in Wales, it will be guided by what has been said. But unless some plan can be devised for delimitation, I would earnestly deprecate the House taking a step which cannot serve the cause the Welsh Members have at heart, namely, the appointment of gentlemen speaking the Welsh language to deal with Welsh legal business. If the House were to pass the Resolution it would cast a most undeserved slight upon a very distinguished County Court Judge, and they would, at the same time, make an attack upon a Member of the Government which I, at all events, as his colleague and a Member of his Party, cannot admit to be justified and cannot acquiesce in.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman and with those who have said that this discussion ought to be kept quite free from Party politics. The right hon. Gentleman says the Government desired to adhere to and carry out the Resolution of 1872. But in order that they may abide by that Resolution, I should with great respect recommend that they should read it. It is perfectly plain that that preliminary process has not been performed either by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down or by the Lord Chancellor. The right hon. Gentleman said the Resolution applied to the whole of Wales, and that unless you limited it, it would be impossible to carry it out. The Resolution does not apply to the whole of Wales, but it is specifically pointed out that it only applies to those parts of Wales where the Welsh language is generally spoken. Therefore, Sir, the delimitation which the right hon. Gentleman desired has already been made, and is the basis of the Resolution, and the only qualification is, "as far as the limits of selection will allow." The Resolution does not speak of Wales generally, but of limited parts where the Welsh language is the predominant language; and the right hon. Gentleman thought he removed that argument by pointing out that in Welshpool, Radnorshire, and Newtown the English language is

spoken. It is not suggested that you should appoint a man who cannot speak English, and it is astounding that logic should be expended upon a proposition of that character.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must contradict the right hon. Gentleman's version of my speech. The injury I anticipated in the English-speaking parts was not in the fact that the Judge knew Welsh, but that if you made that necessary, the choice must be made from a very restricted number of men.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I will come to that directly. I am now upon the Resolution, which is to this effect: that in the districts where the Welsh language is predominant, the Judge appointed shall be able to speak and understand the Welsh language—with this limitation, "so far as the limits of selection will admit." Now, what does that mean but that you are bound to appoint a man who can speak the Welsh language, and upon you lies the onus, when you depart from the principle laid down, of proving that within the limits of selection there was no such man available, possessing the necessary qualifications. I do not go back upon former cases, for I have no means of knowing what were the means of selection. What we have to do with is this particular appointment. Now, Sir, the Government have to show one of two things. They have either to show that this was done when the Resolution was not fully in view, and from that standpoint the hon. Member for Deptford (Mr. Darling) felt the weakness of the position. The Attorney General has not accepted it; the First Lord of the Treasury has not accepted it. The Lord Chancellor might say he had not the Resolution immediately under his notice. That was what the Member for Deptford tried to put into the mouth of the Attorney General; and I may say that it is not quite professional for a junior to put an argument of that kind into the mouth of his leader. The Government must either show that a properly qualified Welsh-speaking barrister could not be found, or that the Lord Chancellor acted *per incuriam*, without having fully in view the obligation imposed upon him by the Resolution of the House. If the Government had said, "This was an oversight, it

was not done deliberately, and we will take the earliest opportunity of removing this gentleman, against whom nobody desires to say a word, and who, no doubt, is perfectly qualified, and put into that district a gentleman who can speak Welsh," that would have been what I call a business-like way of dealing with the matter. Nobody would have desired to press unduly on the Lord Chancellor. But that is not the course that has been taken. They have said this is a justifiable appointment, and that places us in a very difficult position. The Government are bound to tell us what were the overwhelming reasons which induced them to override the Resolution of 1872, and what was the great superiority of this gentleman over other gentlemen that made it necessary for them to depart from the Resolution. I listened to the elaborate ingenuity of the argument of the First Lord of the Treasury, but it never came near the real point, which is, that the House of Commons has said that you ought to appoint as Judges in Welsh-speaking districts men who can speak the Welsh language. If the House of Commons had not said so, every man of common sense would have held that opinion. Why have you not done it? Because the limits of selection did not allow it in this particular case? If so, it means that this individual was so greatly superior to every man who could talk the Welsh language as to overpower his ignorance of the Welsh language and oblige you to place him in that position. But has the right hon. Gentleman attempted to make that statement to the House? The Government have not asserted that, and it is a statement which they would find it very difficult to prove. That being the case, it seems to me that this appointment was distinctly contrary to the Resolution of 1872; and unless you wish to bring that Resolution into contempt, and to fly in the face of every obvious principle which it asserts, I do not think that you can do otherwise than vote for the Resolution. There has been no attempt whatever to show that, in this particular case, there was any necessity for departing from the principle of appointing a gentleman who could talk the Welsh language; and in the absence of any allegation of there being any reason or general principle

why the Resolution should not be adhered to, I cannot conceive, independently of Party considerations, why we should not give a unanimous vote on this occasion.

(7.3.) MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire): I cannot but express the great disappointment with which my hon. Colleagues on this side of the House have listened to the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury. We had hoped he would give us something besides a very clever dialectical argument. But no amount of dialectics will do away with the grievance felt by the peasantry on this subject. In this matter we have had to fight not only against the patronage of the Lord Chancellor, but against the patronage of every Minister. We have brought conviction home in the case of the Education Department; and the Home Secretary, in the matter of factory and mine inspection, has admitted into an Act of Parliament the principle for which we have contended; and the Prime Minister, in appointing Bishops, has admitted the same argument. No Prime Minister would think now of appointing anybody but a Welsh-speaking Bishop to a Welsh see. But in two Departments, the Inland Revenue and that of the Lord Chancellor, we still meet with this difficulty; and the appointment of County Court Judges, the Clerkships of Assize, and Revising Barristers is still a scandal to the administration of justice. I venture to ask the Government to give us a promise that His Honor Judge Beresford shall be removed to some English County Court District, and that on the first opportunity they will appoint a Welsh-speaking barrister to this thoroughly Welsh-speaking district.

Question put.

(7.10.) The House divided :—Ayes 166; Noes 143.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Main Question again proposed.

#### THE BALLOT ACT—ILLITERATE VOTERS.

(7.20.) MR. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.): I rise to call attention to the infringement of the object of the Ballot Act for the protection of the voter from intimidation, practised by means of certain clauses in that Act permitting the illiterate to vote; and

*Sir William Harcourt*

I should have desired to move that, in the opinion of this House, in the interests of true freedom of election, the clauses in the Ballot Act which permit the illiterate to vote should be abolished. It appears to me that the Ballot Act tends to defeat its own object, for some of its clauses have lent themselves to the perpetration of intimidation of the worst description. What are the particular provisions which I maintain require amendment? They are contained in 35 & 36 Vict. (Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Act C. 33, Section 26), which permit that—

“Any voter who makes a declaration, a hereinafter mentioned, that he is unable to read, shall, in the presence of the agents of the candidates, cause the vote of such voter to be marked on a ballot paper in manner directed by such voter,” &c.

I find that in Italy, where they have universal suffrage, in America, where the electoral franchise can be obtained by all males after a short residence, no such system prevails which permits, or allows who those are so uneducated as to be unable to fill up a ballot paper, to exercise the franchise. My objection to this section is not based solely on the undesirability of giving to the uneducated electoral power; but that, under cover of this permission, intimidation can be and is practised—worse intimidation than, I believe, ever was practised under the old system of open voting to all, and of a more flagrant character than in elections in any other civilised State in the world. Those are the provisions with respect to illiterate voting, and in theory there may be little that is objectionable in them. But what have they been in practice? What was the object and intention of the alteration of the system of open voting in this country? Why was the sweeping and radical change from open voting to voting by ballot made? The Attorney General for Ireland, Mr Dowse, who was a Member of the Government of the right hon. Member for Midlothian at the time, said—

“That it would secure the elector from land lord coercion on the one hand, and from intimidation on the other.”

It is not material now to discuss whether there was any necessity for the Act from the point of view of “land lord coercion,” except to say that there is no such allegation made now. But

what is the state of the case with respect to the prevention of intimidation? Why is it that intimidation is still largely practised, and how? I maintain that it is practised through these illiterate provisions. The object which the Government had in view when these provisions were added to the Ballot Bill was the prevention of disfranchisement by reason of illiteracy. This was unmistakably set forth by the late Mr. W. E. Forster, who said—

"All the Government wished to determine by this Amendment was that persons who could not read should not be disfranchised."

But there is no secrecy in the existing law, and the present system allows persons who are not illiterate to pretend that they are illiterate, for the purpose of intimidation. I find, with regard to the election of 1886, in Ireland, the agent of the Roman Catholic candidate for one division of the Midland Counties states that if a voter were doubtful he told him to say he was illiterate; and I have evidence of such practices elsewhere, and of a more recent date. The *Daily News* of December last refers to intimidation of a totally different class. I would point out that at this election at Waterford a totally different condition of affairs existed. We are aware that on that occasion the hon. Member for Waterford was a supporter of the policy of the late Mr. Parnell. On the 24th December, 1891, the *Daily News*, writing on the subject, says—

"At noon more than half the expected total had been polled, and at that time large crowds had collected round the majority of the polling booths, many voters being intimidated by the displays of Party feeling. The crowding round the stations of demonstrative crowds had great effect upon the illiterate voters, the result being that in this class Mr. Redmond obtained a large majority."

I speak on this question as one of broad public policy, for, as far as London is concerned, the right has been legitimately exercised in a *bona fide* manner by *bona fide* illiterates. In my own constituency at the last General Election I believe only four persons claimed to vote as illiterates. The number who voted in this class in England and Scotland was infinitesimally small. The Education Act was passed 20 years ago, and, therefore, every person under 30 ought to be able to read and write

sufficiently to record his vote. The State—that is, the taxpayers—pays nearly the whole cost of education, and, therefore, it has a right to say whether the right of voting should be with those who are so absolutely ignorant that they cannot put a cross against their name. I think the right of illiterates to vote is bad, because it gives power to those who are least able to resist intimidation. Although the case is a very small one as regards England, it is very strong as regards Ireland. Let me give the figures at Donegal election in 1886. Out of 18,000 voters 7,903 claimed that they were unable to read or write, and voted before the returning officer in the presence of the personation agent. In Fermanagh, out of 11,863 voters there were 2,968 illiterates. In Monaghan, out of 12,177 voters there were 3,220; and in Tyrone, out of 26,787 there were 6,957. These figures amount to this, that at the last Election one out of every 74 in Scotland, one out of every 64 in England, and one out of every five in Ireland claimed to vote as illiterate. I admit that at present the people of Ireland are not so well educated as those of England, but that is not the fault of the present Government. In Ulster and Belfast the education is fairly good, equal to that in many parts of England; but I fear the state of things is due to other circumstances. In no part of England is there any great proportion of illiterates, except in Dudley, where there were 1,293. In Marylebone there were only two, and in South Paddington only one. It is a matter of common notoriety that many elections in the past were won by the intimidation of the League, sustained, in some instances, by the terrors of the Church. The wretched voters in many constituencies found themselves forced to obey the agents of the Home Rule Party. They were driven like sheep to the poll, while within the booth itself were local League officials to see that they voted according to orders. This was a clear violation of the secrecy of the Ballot, but it is a system which has grown under the Illiterate Voters' Clause of the Act, specially framed to prevent coercion. Though there is no better form of Government than that which derives its power from a real representative

system, there is none worse than that which permits electors to be driven like sheep to the poll to give their votes in fear of spiritual and bodily danger. I have no wish to entirely disfranchise these voters; there are many ways in which the most illiterate can give his vote with the utmost secrecy, and these will probably be discussed when the Bill of my hon. Friend comes to be considered. As long as you can give the vote secretly I have no objection to it; but under the present system, when the vote is practically given openly before the personation agent it tends to a large amount of danger to the voter, and the chance of his being intimidated. I think in the public interest we should have all the electors equally free to go to the poll. We hear a great deal from our opponents about one man one vote, but I do not think we should consider that under the existing state of affairs. I find that in Wandsworth 15,000 voters have one Representative, while in Derry, 5,000, many of whom are illiterate, have three Representatives. I hope that at some future time the First Lord of the Treasury may take up the question, not only as regards Local Government in Ireland, but as it affects political representation in that country. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that this is not a political question. I know for a fact that there are several leading Members of the opposite Party who thoroughly agree that there are anomalies in the Ballot Act; and I would also point out that at the meeting of the Conservative Party at Birmingham, where I had the honour of bringing forward the proposal that the illiterate vote should be abolished, it met with unanimous approval, on the grounds that by it great injury was done to the freedom of election of Members of Parliament.

(7.42.) MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): I listened to the speech of the hon. Gentleman to see if he gave any specific cases of infringement of the Ballot Act, and found, as I expected, that it would be an attack directed against Ireland. Instead of making an argument in favour of his Motion, he indulged in a violent tirade and an irrelevant attack on the religious gentlemen of Ireland. I have had some

*Mr. Webster*

experience of elections, and, so far as I know, in no instance has any attempt been made by any person of legal responsibility to indulge in illegal conduct on those occasions. I do not know if the hon. Gentleman has ever heard of the Corrupt Practices Act, which makes the most stringent provision against any attempt at the intimidation of any class of voters. The Act was passed in 1884, and a special clause was inserted to deal with the case of any person exercising any form of spiritual intimidation. We have had two General Elections and many bye-elections since that Act was passed, and yet no clergyman has brought himself within the penal clauses. It is a ground for voiding an election if intimidation of that kind is exercised. If, as the hon. Gentleman says, intimidation was practised at certain elections, why were not proceedings taken against the offending parties? I would recommend the hon. Gentleman to be more careful before he makes charges of this kind against any class of the community which he is unable to substantiate. There was not a priest in any booth at the Derry election. A clergyman made the usual declaration as to secrecy, but I did not allow him to enter the booth. During the Sligo election no priests entered the booths on the eastern side of the county, nor do I believe they did so on the western side. Not only do Catholic clergymen take an interest in elections, but clergymen of other denominations also, and I have never heard their conduct questioned. The hon. Gentleman alleges that no protection of the illiterates was exercised. Every person in the booths had to make the statutory declaration as to secrecy, and no attempt has been made to bring a charge against any man for a violation of that declaration. The Ballot Act has been in operation for something like 20 years—

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being found present,

House adjourned at ten minutes before Eight o'clock.





# HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 22nd February, 1892.

## CATTLE DISEASE.

### QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

MR DE LA WARR: My Lords, I after private notice to my noble friend, to ask Her Majesty's Government whether any steps have been taken reference to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle in this country; and also whether there is any ground to suppose that it may have been brought into this country by imported cattle, or whether, as it has been reported, the poison was introduced into this country by raw hides which came from Germany, and have been landed at Harwich? My Lords, I wish merely to refer this question to Her Majesty's Government, believing, as I do, that the answer to which I have referred are known to any of your Lordships, and I have no doubt my statement might be corroborated?

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: My Lords, before the noble Earl replies to my noble Friend's question, I may say I had already given him private notice of a similar question; but I should like also to ask him further, if he will allow me, whether he can corroborate the information as to the importation of this disease through Danish hides, and whether that opinion, which was expressed by the Board of Agriculture, is not now confirmed? My noble friend alluded to the Report, which created great sensation in London on Friday last, that it had been ascertained, through the action of the American Consul, that the disease had been imported by raw hides from a German port landed at Harwich. I should like to know whether that is correct or not; and also to know whether further outbreaks have been notified since the morning of this disease in this country; and what steps the Board of Agriculture have taken to cope with the disease?

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl of Kimberley): My Lords, perhaps both my noble Friends will allow me to answer their questions together. With regard to the question of my noble Friend Mr. De La Warr, I.

[NEW SERIES.]

behind me, I beg to remind him that my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Agriculture on two occasions in the House of Commons—on the 11th inst., I think, and as late as on the 18th—replied to questions at very great length, stating, step by step, what proceedings had been taken by the Board of Agriculture in view of the undoubted outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease; and I think that the House would hardly wish me to read at great length the replies of my right hon. Friend—they were published in all the newspapers; but, if my noble Friend behind me would wish to have them printed, I could, no doubt, give them to him. With regard to the further question of the noble Marquess, no further facts have been elicited by the Department as to the origin of this disease; and with reference to the report which has obtained currency during the last day or two (which I think had its origin in one of the newspapers on Sunday), namely, that it had been found that the origin of the outbreak was the importation of some infected raw hides into this country, the Board of Agriculture have, through their officers, and with the assistance of the Custom House officials, made the very strictest inquiry into that report, and have no reason whatever to believe that there is any truth or foundation in it. I believe I have answered the questions of both my noble Friends.

## TARIFF AGREEMENTS.

### QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I wish to ask the noble Lord the Secretary of State for the Colonies a question of which I have given him private notice. It has been stated in the newspapers that an agreement has been come to between the West Indian Colonies and the United States as to certain articles of tariff, which will allow sugar, I believe, to be imported into the United States on more favourable terms, in return for a certain concession in the tariff for the West Indian Islands. I should be glad to know from the noble Lord whether that statement is true; whether the changes in the tariffs in the West Indian Islands involves any differential duties against this country, or merely alters the duties so as to lower them for all



importers; and, lastly, whether Papers will be laid on the Table in a short time?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Lord KNUTSFORD): My Lords, in reply to the last part of the noble Earl's question, I would say that the Papers will be laid on the Table at the earliest possible opportunity. In the meantime I had better answer the other question of the noble Earl at a little more length, as the subject is one of very great importance. About the close of last year the Colonies were unofficially and informally notified that, unless they were prepared to make reductions of their duties, it would be necessary for the President of the United States, under Article 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act, to re-impose duties on sugar shipped from the Colonies into the United States. This was a question of vital importance to the West Indian Colonies, and they urgently pressed Her Majesty's Government to negotiate with the United States on their behalf. I need hardly say that Her Majesty's Government were very ready and willing to do so. The result of the negotiations has been that the different Colonies (Grenada only excepted, because, I think, she does not import sugar into the United States) have agreed in some cases to abolish altogether, and in other cases to reduce, their import duties upon certain articles; and I may mention that those articles are, in the main, articles of food, or articles of general popular consumption in the islands. I will just mention some of them, because I know the noble Earl takes an interest in this question—bacon, bread, lard, corn-meal, flour, petroleum, &c. The reduction applies to all these articles whatever is the country of their origin, and therefore there is no question at all of differential duties in the matter. Her Majesty's Government have very readily assented to the reduction of these import duties upon articles of food and articles of general consumption, because it is a step in the direction of a policy which has been pressed upon these Colonies by successive Secretaries of State, certainly by the noble Earl himself in 1881 and 1882, and, I think, probably by the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) also, due regard of course being had to securing that there shall be no great loss of revenue. I will only add

*The Earl of Kimberley*

that the question of how to make up the loss of revenue, which will be made by these reductions, is now under the consideration of all the Legislatures.

#### MEDINA TUNNEL BILL [

##### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

VISCOUNT BARRINGTON: I beg to hand in to your Lordships a letter which I received on the morning (*handing in the same*) no more about the Bill than is in that letter, namely, that the Council do not approve of it except in certain circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSIONS (The Earl of MORLEY): The Council must make their recommendations at the proper time.

Bill read 2<sup>a</sup>.

#### EAST INDIA OFFICERS BILL

(No. 10.)

##### COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Viscount CROSS): My Lords, I stated, when I had the honour of introducing your Lordships' leave to introduce this Bill, that I thought the draft might be very much simplified. I had only presented it in its present form because it was the form in which it passed the Standing Committee of your Lordships' House last year. I now propose, with your Lordships' permission, to go through the Bill at a second stage *pro forma*, and after the Bill has been received to introduce the amendments and put down the Committee on Thursday.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Bill reported without Amendments made; Bill referred to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next; and to be printed and amended. (No. 18.)

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL [H.L.]—(No. 4.)

House in Committee (according to Order).

Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3<sup>a</sup> to-morrow.

ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL  
BILL—(No. 5.)  
SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD STEWARD (the Earl of MOUNT-EDGCUMBE): My Lords, your Lordships have already passed this Bill in several successive Sessions, and I do not propose to take up your time by giving explanations which have been given before.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>."  
(*The Lord Steward.*)

Motion agreed to: Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

INDIAN COUNCILS ACT (1861) AMEND-  
BILL [H.L.]—(No. 3.)  
THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

Bill read 3<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Monday, 22nd February, 1892.*

QUESTIONS.

ILLEGAL BEAM TRAWLING OFF THE  
SCOTCH COAST.

MR. DUFF (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if the attention of the Secretary for Scotland has been called to the Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland for last year, wherein repeated reference is made to the systematic evasion of the law by beam trawlers, and to the total inadequacy of the sea police at present employed to protect the waters closed against beam

trawling; and if it is the intention of the Government, in consequence of this official information, to station a Marine Police on the coast of Scotland sufficient to maintain law and order, at present subject to serious infringement by what the Report characterises as the illegal depredations of the trawlers?

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith, &c.) had notice of the following question:—To ask the Lord Advocate whether the Admiralty has yet consented to place the ships in Scottish waters necessary to secure the protected areas from illegal depredation by trawlers?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I propose to include in my answer a reply to the question of the hon. Member for Leith Burghs. The Secretary for Scotland has had under his attention the Report of the Fishery Board, to which the hon. Member refers. Her Majesty's Government are well aware that the laws in relation to trawling are at present largely evaded. There are obvious difficulties in effectively patrolling 800 miles of seaboard, but the Admiralty have strengthened their force of gunboats off the Scotch coast and are making careful investigations as to the best means of dealing with this difficult question.

MR. DUFF: In the number of vessels appointed for the purpose will there be any special protection for the Moray Firth?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON: That is a matter of detail with which I am not acquainted. I must ask for notice of the question.

MR. H. T. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews, &c.): Can the right hon. Gentleman answer a question which was formerly put to the late Lord Advocate and upon which he said he would make inquiry, whether the average speed of the steam trawlers is higher than that of any of the vessels employed in the Marine Police Service? Can the right hon. Gentleman say if that is the case, as, according to my information, it is?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON: I am sorry I am not able to give the hon. Member the information he desires at this moment, but I will make inquiry into the matter.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON : Did I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Admiralty force had been strengthened, or that it was proposed to strengthen it?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON : I believe it has already been strengthened.

#### THE TITLE OF LORD MAYOR.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Government will recommend to Her Majesty to confer on the Chief Magistrate of the City of Belfast the style and title of Lord Mayor, now that Dundee, recently granted a City Charter, and with a population considerably less, has just had its Chief Magistrate raised to the position of Lord Provost? I may be allowed to add that, in asking this question, I have not the slightest feeling of jealousy towards Dundee, and in no way object to the title of Lord Provost.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will say, when answering the question of the hon. Member for South Belfast (suggesting that the style and title of Lord Mayor should be conferred on the Chief Magistrate of the City of Belfast), whether he will favourably entertain a similar application on behalf of the ancient Cities of Cork, Limerick, and Waterford?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.) : I will answer both questions at the same time. The Government will be prepared to consider the question of advising Her Majesty to confer the title of Lord Mayor upon the Chief Magistrate of the City of Belfast, having due regard to what has been done in other parts of the United Kingdom. With regard to Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, those cities do not present the conditions of population and growing industrial importance which would entitle them to be placed on the same level as Belfast.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) : Can the right hon. Gentleman say how many Scotch cities have Lord Provosts?

MR. JOHNSTON : Five.

MR. MATTHEWS : Yes; I think five

#### THE GLIN BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that when the Glin Board of Guardians was dissolved last year three divisions of that Union were transferred, without subdivision, to Listowel Union, and the services of the dispensary doctors retained by sealed order of the Local Government Board; can he state why the services of the rate collector for these divisions was not also retained, in accordance with the precedent followed in the case of Gortin Union when it was united with that of Omagh and Strabane; has the Local Government Board sanctioned the appointment of Mr. Mulvihill as rate collector, although his time is occupied as rent warner and land bailiff in the employment of an *ex officio* member of the Listowel Board, and does this sanction involve the payment of a pension of £10 a year to the late collector, though he is fitted in every way to discharge the duty; and will he institute inquiry into this matter?

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.) : On the dissolution of Glin Union seven electoral divisions were transferred to Listowel Union. The cases of the medical officer and the poor rate collector were dealt with differently by reason of the fact that the transferred divisions formed a complete dispensary district, but did not form a complete poor rate collector's district. The formation of the new district or districts for collection purposes was, therefore, left for the consideration of the Guardians. In the case of the Gortin Union, the electoral divisions transferred formed complete collectors' districts. The new rate collector was elected by the Listowel Guardians by a considerable majority, and the reply to the inquiries made by the Local Government Board being satisfactory, the appointment was sanctioned. It was the case that the Guardians of the Glin (dissolved) Union granted their collector a pension of £10 0s. 5d.

#### RETURN OF RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) : I beg to ask the President

of the Board of Trade when the Returns of Accidents and Casualties on Railways under "The Regulation of Railways Act, 1889," for the six months ending 31st December, 1891, will be presented and distributed?

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): There are no such Returns referred to in the Act of 1889. The hon. Member probably refers to the "Regulation of Railways Act, 1871." The Returns of Accidents and Casualties furnished under that Act will, I hope, be presented early next week, and distributed as soon afterwards as the revision of proofs can be completed.

#### THE NORTHERN TERRITORY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

**MR. WATT** (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received the Report of Mr. Parkes with reference to the resources of the Northern Territory of South Australia; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay the same upon the Table?

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES** (Baron H. de WORMS, Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Report in question has not yet been received.

#### GLASGOW POSTAL DISTRICTS.

**MR. WATT**: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he has yet been able to investigate and arrive at a decision as to the anomalous position of Parkhead owing to the existing postal area in the east end of Glasgow; whether he is aware that Springfield Road is one-half in the Glasgow area and one-half in the Parkhead district, and that letters are frequently thus delayed as long as a day through business premises being a few feet on one or other side of the postal boundary; and whether, seeing Parkhead is one of the oldest and most populous districts of Glasgow, there is any objection to extend to it the same privileges as have been granted to Calton, Anderson, Bridgeton, and other similarly situated districts?

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): Inquiry has already been made in connection with a written application received from the hon. Member some time ago on the subject of Parkhead,

and a revision of the postal arrangements there and in the other suburban districts of Glasgow is now under consideration, under which the morning delivery and other services at Parkhead will be placed as nearly as circumstances will allow on the same footing as in other parts of the city. It is hoped, also, that it will be found practicable to include the whole of Springfield Road in the Glasgow Town District. But as the revision is a large one, some further time may necessarily be occupied before it can be carried out.

#### THE ORDNANCE SURVEY.

**MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH** (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the grievances of those employed in the Ordnance Survey, which concluded its examination in July, 1891, has made a Report; whether he will lay a Copy upon the Table; and whether the grievances complained of are to be remedied, and when?

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): It is not correct that the Departmental Committee which was appointed to inquire into the questions of the pay and general position of the Civil servants employed on the Ordnance Survey concluded their examination on 21st July, 1891. The examination was not concluded until 26th October last. The Report of the Committee has not yet been made, and I understand that its preparation has been delayed by reason of the serious illness of the Chairman, Colonel Leach. I will endeavour to accelerate the production of the Report; and as soon as it is presented I will at once consider what action, if any, is to be taken thereon; and I am aware of no reason why the Report should not be laid upon the Table.

#### SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS OF SCOTLAND.

**MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH**: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that many heads of families in the Highlands and Islands are obliged to leave their homes for the Lowlands in pursuit of work, remaining absent for months at a time; whether School Boards have hitherto, and with

beneficial results, prosecuted, when necessary, the mother, or the temporary head of the household, for default in sending children to school; whether he is aware that it has lately been decided in the Supreme Courts of Scotland that the father, wherever he may be resident, is alone responsible for such default; and whether he will give legislative effect to the representations of various school boards who desire ready recourse for defaults in school attendance?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON: The answer to the two first paragraphs of the question is in the affirmative. I have not had an opportunity of seeing the decision referred to, but I understand the Court held that, on the facts before them, the father had the actual custody of his children, and I am not aware that the decision went further. I have no reason to believe that a desire for a change in the law is widely felt; and it appears inexpedient to extend the definition of "parent" merely because the Court has held in a particular case that the responsibility rested with the father.

#### TREASON FELONY CONVICTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many persons have been convicted of treason felony in Great Britain during the past 10 years; and of those so convicted, how many have been released, how many have died in prison, and how many of those released have died or become insane?

MR. MATTHEWS: The number of persons convicted of treason felony in Great Britain during the past 10 years and received into English convict prisons under sentence of penal servitude is 23. Of this number four have been released; two have died in prison. I have no information as to the subsequent history of those who have been released from prison.

#### THE GREEN STREET COURT HOUSE, DUBLIN.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on what basis the respective contributions of the Treasury, the Corporation of Dublin, and the Grand Jury of County Dublin towards the reconstruction of Green

*Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh*

Street Court House are calculated; how long the present Court House has been in existence; and if his attention has been directed to the reports in the newspapers of a recent important criminal trial, in the progress of which the leading counsel for the accused had twice to leave the Court owing to the bad smells proceeding from the drains underneath the Court House; and to a further incident reported as follows:—

"When the jury was sworn one of the jurors complained of a great draught in the jury box.

"The Lord Chief Justice said the special jurors of Dublin should not be allowed to get the influenza, and ordered that the windows should be closed.

"One of the jurors tried to close the window near the jury box, but was unable to do so.

"The Lord Chief Justice: This is scandalous. This state of things is an outrage upon civilization."

If, considering that the most important business discharged at Green Street is the hearing of criminal causes, the Government will consider whether they cannot defray the whole cost of rebuilding what is practically a Government property; and if steps will be taken at once in that direction?

MR. JACKSON: The total cost for building a new Court House in substitution for the existing one at Green Street, Dublin, was estimated at £40,500. The Treasury, in 1883, agreed to contribute £13,500—i.e., one-third—the remainder to be borne in the proportions of one-third by the county and two-thirds by the city. In arriving at the conclusion that those were the most equitable proportions, the Lord Lieutenant and the Treasury had before them returns obtained from the Clerks of the Peace and of the Crown of cases entered for hearing at Green Street in the preceding five years. The Grand Jury on behalf of the County, and the Corporation on behalf of the City, accepted these proportions. I have no information enabling me to say how long the present Court House has been in existence. The Irish Government have observed the reports in the Press of the remarks of the learned Judge in regard to the discreditable condition of the present building. The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in describing this Court House as practically Government property. It is used as the Quarter Session Court House for the City of

Dublin, at which the Recorder sits for the hearing of a multitudinous class of cases, and it is also used for the sittings of the Commission of Oyer and Terminer for both the City and the County of Dublin — Commissions which are held frequently, and correspond to the Circuits of Assize in ordinary counties. I cannot hold out any hope of better terms being offered.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Has the right hon. Gentleman any objection to consider, so far as Crown business is concerned, which necessitates the attendance of jurors, whether the Government could not arrange that this should be transacted at the Four Courts, leaving the civil business to be done at Green Street?

MR. JACKSON: I have no objection to consider the suggestion. I will communicate with Dublin, and ascertain if there is any possibility of this being done.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman also consider whether it would not be likely to facilitate matters to withdraw the insult offered to the City of Dublin by restoring the name of the Lord Mayor to the Commission?

MR. JACKSON: I am not aware that there is any insult in the matter.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that the name of the Lord Mayor of Dublin shall be restored to the Commission? For centuries the Chief Magistrate of Dublin had been included in the Commission of Oyer and Terminer, and withdrawing the name was an insult to the Corporation.

MR. JACKSON: I am not aware of it, and I am not prepared to accept the construction put upon it by the hon. Member.

#### THE POST OFFICE AND RAILWAY COMPANIES.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been drawn to the remark in the Report of the Select Committee on Revenue Estimates of 11th July, 1888, as to the loss to the State from "the enormous increase of services gratuitously performed for the Railway Companies" by messages so sent under a contract made in 1870, and also

to the reference made to this matter by the late Postmaster General in Committee of Supply, on 23rd July, 1890; and whether he can now say how the matter stands as between the State and the Railway Companies?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: This matter has for a long time received the anxious consideration of the Post Office, and we have been during the last few months in communication, by meetings and correspondence, with the representatives of the Railway Companies. No arrangement has yet been arrived at, and the last communication was from the Post Office. In the meantime I am glad to say that the growth of the loss in question appears to have ceased.

#### IRISH MAIL SERVICES.

CAPTAIN M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, although the delays in the mail service to Ireland by Stranraer and Larne have been very frequent since the institution of the accelerated service on 1st September last, it is the case that only on four occasions has the delay occurring between Stranraer and Belfast exceeded 15 minutes to the end of January last?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: No, Sir; I am informed that, reckoning from the time of the complete transfer of the mails to the packet at Stranraer, upwards of 15 minutes have been lost before the arrival at Belfast on 30 occasions between the 1st September and the 31st January. On 25 of those occasions time was lost by not starting after the mails were on board.

#### POSTAL SERVICE IN MACROOM DISTRICT, CO. CORK.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether a memorial has been received from the inhabitants of Ashgrove and the district situated between Macroom and Kilmartyna, County Cork, through the Cork postmaster, asking for the establishment of a sub-post in the district; and whether, having regard to the extent of the district and the convenience of the inhabitants, their request will be granted?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: A memorial has been received asking for the establishment of a post office at Ashgrove or Raleigh, in the neighbourhood men-

tioned in the hon. Member's question; but as the service is already carried on in that district at an outlay considerably in excess of the revenue, no further expenditure can be incurred. About 12 letters a day only would benefit by the proposal.

DR. TANNER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that his late lamented predecessor, Mr. Raikes, promised last year to see into the complaints made by the inhabitants of the Macroom district with a view to having their grievances redressed?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Yes, Sir, inquiries were made with the result I have stated.

DR. TANNER: I shall refer to the subject in discussion on the Estimates.

#### SALARIES OF IRISH SUB-POST-MASTERS.

MR. TUIITE (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is prepared to take into consideration the case of the Irish sub-Postmasters with a view of increasing their salaries; and whether the person who fills the position is obliged to provide an office, stationery, twine, wax, &c., for which no compensation is given, while the salary in many cases is as low as £4 per annum, and the hours of duty 13 to 19 per day?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The salaries of sub-Postmasters in Ireland are regulated by the same scale as those of sub-Postmasters in the rest of the United Kingdom, and as the payments made under this scale are found to be sufficient in England and Scotland, it is not considered necessary to increase them in Ireland.

#### FOG ACCIDENTS IN HER MAJESTY'S DOCKYARDS.

MR. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if in Her Majesty's Dockyards he proposes the construction of stanchions and chains, or any other arrangement, along the quays, to safeguard life from accidents in the event of fogs, as recommended by the President of the Board of Trade to the Joint Committee of the London and St. Katharine, the East and West India, the Victoria and Albert, and the Tilbury Docks?

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): All the Admiralty docks  
*Sir James Fergusson*

and quays are as a rule protected by stanchions and chains; but, as it is possible that in a few cases there may be some omission, I have called for a Report from the different naval yards.

#### REUTER'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

MR. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in addition to the contract for the reporting of the Parliamentary Debates by Reuter's Telegram Company, Limited, he will, without giving the names of other tenderers, supply a concise statement, for the information of the House, of the terms offered by them, so that they may be compared with those of the accepted offer?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): As I stated last week in answer to a question, it is unusual to publish the names of the unsuccessful tenderers, but I may state generally that the 15 unsuccessful tenders varied from £245 to £650 per volume.

MR. LENG: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the publication of advertisements along with *Reuter's Parliamentary Debates*, in addition to their publication in the *Board of Trade Journal*, has created great dissatisfaction among newspaper and other publishers in London, on the ground that it constitutes Government competition with private business, and whether the Treasury will withhold their assent from similar arrangements for inserting advertisements in Parliamentary publications until those affected have an opportunity of stating their objections to the system?

SIR J. GORST: No, Sir; no complaint of the kind has ever reached me. The *Parliamentary Debates* are not a Parliamentary but a private publication, and there can, therefore, be no competition of Government with private business. I am not prepared to give such an undertaking as the hon. Member desires.

MR. LENG: Will the right hon. Gentleman further say, Was it one of the stipulations of the contract that the contractor should have power to insert advertisements?

SIR J. GORST: The contract has been laid on the Table. I cannot answer from recollection what are the stipulations, but I do not think that was one of the stipulations.

## QUEEN'S PLATES IN IRELAND.

MR. O'KEEFFE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if, in the interest of promoting better breeding of horses amongst the farmers in Ireland, he will recommend a further distribution of the Queen's Plates for winners of races in that country; and whether, in view of the fact that such plates are now practically confined to entries at the Curragh Race Meetings, he will, on every requirement being satisfied, restore to the Limerick Race Stewards the Queen's Plate formerly for many years at their disposal?

\*MR. JACKSON: I am not aware of any intention to ask Parliament to provide an increased amount for Queen's Plates in Ireland. But I would remind the hon. Member that the present Government have, under the Probate Duties Act of 1888, provided a sum of £5,000 annually, payable to the Royal Dublin Society, for the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle in Ireland; and the Congested Districts Board are also taking important steps in that direction. As regards the particular case of Limerick, the races there had one of the Queen's Plates apparently for but a very short period. It was withdrawn some 22 years ago in consequence of the course there not being suitable, and given to Cork. I am not aware of any generally expressed desire to remove this plate from Cork.

## THE CONVICT JOSEPH MULLETT.

MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the low state of health of Joseph Mullett, now confined in Maryborough Gaol; whether his attention has been called to the report in the *National Press* of 17th November, 1891, of the proceedings at the inquest on the remains of P. W. Nally (Mullett's former fellow prisoner, who died in Mountjoy Prison), wherein the following statement appears as having been written by Nally from Downpatrick Gaol:—

"Poor Joe Mullett is very delicate. Every morning we expect to hear of his being found dead. It is not the doctor's fault. He has made several reports concerning him, yet the Board take no notice of them"; and whether, under the circumstances, and in view of the long term of im-

prisonment which Mullett has already suffered, he will consider the desirability of releasing him?

\*MR. JACKSON: The General Prisons Board report that there is no ground for the suggestion contained in this question as to the alleged serious state of the health of the convict Joseph Mullett; but that, on the contrary, his general health has advanced, and he has within the past year increased a stone in weight.

## NEWCASTLE HARBOUR, COUNTY DOWN.

MR. M'CARTAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to a report in the *Irish News* of the 17th instant, in which it is stated that five fishermen of Newcastle, County Down, were drowned on Monday last; whether he is aware that, owing to the insufficiency and danger of the Newcastle harbour, the fishermen are obliged to expose their lives in small boats unsuited for deep-sea fishing; and whether, considering the repeated warnings given to the Government as to the danger caused to the lives of the fishermen at Newcastle, owing to the present state of the harbour, steps will now be taken to provide safe and sufficient harbour accommodation there?

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): In relation to this subject, I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that the charge for the harbour was forced upon the Grand Jury of County Down in spite of their protest and their representations that it was unsuitably placed, that it was faulty in construction, and that its maintenance was quite beyond the means of the local rates?

SIR J. GORST: I am afraid it is not possible for me to be aware of these details upon Irish questions. In reply to the question on the Paper, I can only refer the hon. Member to the answer given by my predecessor in Office on 7th March, 1890, and by the late Chief Secretary for Ireland on 30th April, 1891, to which, I am sorry to say, I can add nothing.

DR. TANNER: But has the right hon. Gentleman had his attention drawn to the fact that these men lost their lives through the non-completion of Government work, a non-completion to which



for many years, attention has been drawn by questions in this House? Is he prepared to sanction a state of things which tends to destroy life?

SIR J. GORST: No, Sir; I am not aware of anything of the kind.

COLONEL WARING: I will put down my question for a future day.

#### CLERKS IN THE CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

MR. M'CARTAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that certain clerks of the Central Telegraph Office receive £116 a year in the first class after a service of ten and a half years, and other clerks with services of ten years and five months and ten years and four months only receive £86 a year in the second class; whether the difference of salaries arise solely from the classification system; and whether, considering the grave discontent which this inequality is causing in the Service, he will inquire into the matter in order to have it remedied?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The statement made in the first paragraph is literally correct. In 1890, in connection with the general revision of the indoor establishment of sorting clerks and telegraphists, a large addition was made to the first class of telegraphists at the Central Telegraph Office in order to provide for duties proper to that class, and the new appointments thus created were filled by promotion from the class below. The promoted officers were fortunate in obtaining such a material increase of pay, but of course this good fortune involved no hardship upon their colleagues who are left on the second class, and who, when their turn comes for promotion, will enjoy a similar advantage. Those in receipt of salaries of £86 a year are by no means at a standstill, as they rise by increments of £6 a year to the maximum of the class, £110 a year. Seeming inequalities such as Mr. M'Cartan indicates must generally follow the re-organisation of an establishment, and there is nothing exceptional in the case of the Central Telegraph Office which calls for a re-settlement of the costly revision granted after full and careful consideration little more than a year ago.

*Dr. Tanner*

#### LEVEL CROSSINGS ON THE LANCA- SHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.):

I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that at an inquest held on Thursday 4th February, at Portsmouth, near Todmorden, on James Hamworth, who was killed on 2nd February at Portsmouth level crossing, the jury requested the Coroner to make representations to the Directors of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company as to the dangerous arrangements at Portsmouth Station; also that at an inquest held in 1891 on a little girl named Sarah Dawson, who was killed at Walsden level crossing on the same branch of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, the jury gave their opinion

"that the company are practically responsible for this death, which would have been avoided had they constructed the bridge according to the plans deposited with the Todmorden Local Board two years ago, and that they are deserving of the severest censure for their negligence in this matter";

whether he has observed that it appears from the evidence that about 30 children have to pass this crossing three times a day to attend school; whether he is aware that on the same branch line there are seven other dangerous level crossings, some of which are daily used by several hundreds of persons; and whether, having regard to the repeated accidents at these crossings, he will direct an inquiry to be held by an Inspector of the Board of Trade into the circumstances of the fatal accidents at Walsden and Portsmouth level crossings, and make urgent representations to the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company that they should promptly provide bridges or subways where necessary?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH:

The facts are as stated in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question. As regards the accident to James Hamworth, the Board of Trade have been in communication with the company, who have stated that their engineer had, prior to the accident in question, been instructed to prepare plans for providing additional accommodation. I think it right, however, to state that the unfortunate man who was killed refused to follow the warnings of the company's servants. As regards the accident to Sarah Dawson at the Walden level

ing, I have also been in communication with the company, who have undertaken, pending the erection of a bridge, that a man shall be stationed at level crossing to superintend the works. I am informed by the company that the delay in erecting a bridge has been caused by difficulties in obtaining necessary land. The Board of Trade has no information of the deposit of money for the construction of a bridge by the Todmorden Local Board, but the necessity for the erection of a bridge has been further pressed on the company. It appears to be only three other crossings on the Todmorden and Burnley roads which cross public roads. I am informed that the traffic is not large on these roads; the crossings have been authorised by Parliament, and I have no power to order the erection of bridges.

#### EXISTENCE OF A DISTRICT REGISTRY IN BELFAST.

[MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware of the great inconvenience caused to the merchants of Belfast in not having a local registry for the issue of writs of summons; and whether he will consider the desirability of establishing a district registry there?]  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. MADDEN, Dublin University): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. The matter referred to by the hon. Member is not under the control of the Executive Government. Under the provisions of the Irish Judicature Act, 1877, all matters connected with the issue of writs are regulated by rules of Court to be made by the Lord Lieutenant, with the concurrence of a majority of the Judges, including the Lord Chancellor; and provision for the issue of writs has been made by the 5th Consolidated Order recently made by them.

[MR. SEXTON: What I would like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman is whether there are 83 places in England and Wales where these writs may be issued, but only one in Ireland; and whether he or the Chief Secretary will refer the Lord Lieutenant to a conference with the Judges, so as to ascertain whether new Courts may be established?]  
MR. MADDEN: I presume the

question was considered by the Judges when they framed the Consolidated Rules within the last few months. I have explained that the matter cannot be dealt with by the Executive Government. However, I shall bring the matter under the notice of the Lord Chancellor.

MR. SEXTON: I shall take the earliest opportunity of moving that the City of Belfast should no longer labour under so absurd a difficulty.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Cork): I would ask whether, in addition to the rules of Court, an amendment to the law does not require certain Treasury arrangements for providing the necessary staff?

MR. MADDEN: The matter cannot be dealt with at all except by a majority of the Judges; but, of course, if a majority of the Judges came to the conclusion that there should be a local issue of writs in Belfast, it would, no doubt, be necessary to make provisions to utilise existing offices, or to make other arrangements. The matter, in the first instance, is one for the decision of a majority of the Judges.

#### LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN ATHLONE.

MR. DONAL SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction prevails amongst the labourers of the Athlone Union at the delay in the erection of labourers' cottages in that union; whether any representation on the matter has been made to the Irish Local Government Board; and if he can state how many cottages have been erected by the Poor Law Guardians in Athlone Union since the passing of the Labourers' Act?

MR. JACKSON: The Local Government Board are not aware of any general dissatisfaction in regard to this matter. No cottages have yet been erected under the Labourers' Act, but a final order was issued on the 23rd of December last providing for the erection in the union of 15 cottages, and the Local Government Board now have under consideration an additional scheme for further cottages.

### IMPERIAL TOBACCO CORPORATION OF PERSIA.

MR. CUNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps Her Majesty's Government are taking to protect the interests of Major Talbot and other British subjects, shareholders in the Imperial Tobacco Corporation of Persia, and of the *employés* of that Corporation, who are injured by the refusal of the Persian people to permit of its establishment in Persia, although a considerable sum of money had been paid for the concession given by His Majesty the Shah?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Her Majesty's Government are in communication with the Chairman of the Company on the one hand, and with the Persian Government on the other, with a view to proper compensation being given to the Corporation for the abolition of the concession.

MR. C. GRAHAM: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether Her Majesty's Government propose to force this compensation from the people of Persia after they have refused to allow the monopoly?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I have informed the hon. Gentleman that Her Majesty's Government are in communication with the Persian Government with a view to arriving at a satisfactory solution.

MR. C. GRAHAM: What I want to ask the hon. Gentleman is, who is to pay this compensation after the people have refused to establish the monopoly?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: That I conceive will be a matter for the Persian Government to settle with the Persian people.

MR. C. GRAHAM: Whilst recognising that this is a matter for the Persian Government to settle with the Persian people, I hope that our Government will not commit the infamy of forcing this compensation upon the Persian people. That is what I wish to arrive at.

### SMALL ARMS FACTORIES.

MR. C. GRAHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a "Maxim Lock," which is supplied by contractors to Government at £20, is made at Enfield for about £1; whether a five-barrel Nordenfolt gun, for which con-

tractors charge £338 8s., can be made at Enfield for £120; whether received about 20 operatives have been dismissed from Enfield; and whether contracts have been given to Sheffield firm at greatly higher rates than cost price at Enfield; and, if so, will he explain this course has been adopted?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincoln's Inn, Lincoln's Inn): The Enfield price for a Maxim lock cannot be definitely stated, as the manufacture is not yet completed, but it will probably be about £6. The contract price was £20. A five-barrel Nordenfolt gun could be made at Enfield, with appliances complete, for £135. The contract price was as stated in the question; but it is a matter which no purchases are now made. More than 20 men have been dismissed from Enfield. The only contract made out at Sheffield was for sword-bayonets in 1889, to a firm who were encouraged to take up the trade to avoid our having to resort to Germany. The price was 8 per cent. above the then cost of production in the Ordnance factories. I say generally that all these questions point to the satisfactory conclusion that articles are produced more cheaply in the Ordnance factories. Of course, then, so under their present management it does not affect the principle which we have often laid down, and which the House has accepted, that, instead of extending Government factories, it is much wiser, in the interests of the country, to encourage private firms to assist in producing the necessary war material.

CAPTAIN BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield): I wish to ask whether it is the fact that the establishment at Enfield has been reduced rather than extended?

MR. E. STANHOPE: It has been reduced, but only by a very small number.

MR. HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether arrangements have been recently made to turn out 60 rifles per week at the Royal Small Arms Factory, Sparkbrook, instead of 4 formerly, whilst the number turned out at the Enfield Small Arms Factory has been reduced from 1,200 to 500 per week; and whether any men have been discharged from the Small Arms F

arkbrook, during the last two or three weeks, other than fitters, though the numbers at Enfield have been largely reduced?

**MR. E. STANHOPE:** No alteration whatever has been made in the output of Sparkbrook, which has always been a small one. On the other hand, the output at Enfield has been very large; and, looking to the reduced orders to be expected next year, some reduction is necessary there, though not to the extent anticipated by my hon. Friend.

#### BRITISH COLONIES AND THE M'KINLEY TARIFF.

**COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT** (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, under the Reciprocity Section of the United States M'Kinley Tariff Act, the Government of President Harrison is constrained Her Majesty's Government to grant admission, without Customs duties or any other national, colonial, or municipal charge, to 58 classes of American goods, manufactured and otherwise, and a reduction in other classes of 50 per cent. and 25 per cent. on the duty designated in the respective Colonial tariffs, into the British Colonies of British Guiana, Trinidad, Tobago, Barbadoes, Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis, Dominica, St. Vincent, and their dependencies; if such remission of duties in the Crown Colonies applies equally to the staple manufacturers of Sheffield and other parts of the British Empire, hitherto taxed from 7 to 10 per cent., and to the natural products of Canada, Newfoundland, and Australia; if the United States will reciprocally give a free market or more favourable terms to similar articles, the production of such British Colonies, than the production of the United Kingdom or other parts of the British Empire; if this fiscal change has met with the approval of the unofficial Members of the Legislative Councils of the several Colonies concerned; if the inhabitants thereof have been or will be consulted as to the levy of the Colonial revenues by direct instead of indirect taxation as heretofore; and if all Papers on the subject will be laid upon the Table?

**BARON H. DE WORMS:** The Colonies named in the first paragraph of the question have decided to lower or abolish their import duties upon certain articles of food and other goods entering largely into popular consumption. Such remission of duties applies to those articles whatever the country of their origin. There is no question of differential duties in the matter, nor was there any constraint upon Her Majesty's Government, who readily assented to a step in the direction of a policy of reduction of duties upon articles of food, which has been pressed upon the Colonies by successive Secretaries of State, and which had the approval of the unofficial Members of the Legislative Councils of the Colonies concerned. Any taxation required to make good the loss of revenue caused by the remissions to which I have referred has been the subject of Debate in the Legislatures of the Colonies concerned. Papers on the subject have been laid on the Table.

**COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT:** I wish to ask whether the American Government have not obtained a remission of the duties on manufactured articles in the West India Islands named?

**BARON H. DE WORMS:** I can add nothing to the answer I have given.

#### IRISH MAILS.

**MR. T. W. RUSSELL** (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the fact that the Great Southern Railway of Ireland and the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland have refused to carry Her Majesty's mails over their lines from Newcomen Bridge Junction on the Dublin Junction Railway, on the ground that the junction is unsafe, he will inquire into the nature of the alleged danger?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** The Post Office has not had occasion to make any proposal to the two companies mentioned, but we are expecting to receive from the Loop Line Company a time-table for the through conveyance of the mails. We have heard that the chairmen of the companies named have expressed themselves unfavourably to the use of the line, but as it has only just been passed by the Board of Trade perhaps these objections may be got over. At all events, the Post Office

could not intervene in questions of railway engineering and management.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is it not a fact that owing to the condition of the line the mails are carried from one point to another?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Yes, that is so, and we shall be exceedingly glad to avail ourselves of the loop line, so that there may be no break of bulk of the mails between Queenstown and Kingstown.

#### SCOTCH PRISONS.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Committee of inquiry on Scotch Prisons has reported; and, if so, whether he will lay the Report upon the Table of the House?

SIR JOHN GORST: I am informed that the Committee have not yet presented their Report to the Secretary for Scotland.

MR. CALDWELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when it will be presented?

SIR JOHN GORST: No; I think the question must be addressed to my right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate.

#### THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

MR. CONWAY (Leitrim, N): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a Sub-Committee has been formed in the Glengarriff Electoral Division, scheduled in the Manorhamilton Union, to assist in the working of the Congested Districts Act by the Congested Districts Board; and whether the Congested Districts Board would have any objection to consulting that Committee regarding the steps it proposes taking in that division?

\*MR. JACKSON: The Congested Districts Board will give careful consideration to representations or suggestions made by any person connected with the electoral division mentioned, or with any other electoral division in a congested districts county.

#### THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether, notwithstanding the fact that the Despatch of Lord Cross of the 12th September,

*Sir James Fergusson*

1889, recommends certain offices in the Uncovenanted Civil Service of India to be filled exclusively by Indians, an executive order can at any time authorise the introduction of Europeans to any extent to these offices?

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I must refer the hon. Member to the Despatch itself, which is contained in the Blue Book of 1890. The precise nature and number of the applications which will be thrown open to natives of India in the reorganization of the Services is still under consideration, and any unofficial statement that has hitherto appeared upon the subject is premature.

MR. MAC NEILL: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in the despatch to which he refers me my question was fully borne out? I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, how many Europeans (including Eurasians), and how many Indians in both the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Civil Services of India were, on the 31st March, 1886, drawing annual salaries of Rs.5,000, and upwards, and what was the proportion at that date of Europeans (including Eurasians) to Indians?

\*MR. CURZON: The figures asked for were all given in my answer to a similar question of the hon. Member on Friday, and I can only refer him to that answer.

MR. MAC NEILL: I think the hon. Gentleman is under a mistake. The figures were given collectively, and not individually. I must repeat my question to-morrow.

#### THE ALLOTMENTS ACT, 1887.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has, or can procure, the necessary information to enable him to state how many Rural Sanitary Authorities in England and Wales have acquired, by voluntary arrangement under the powers given to them by "The Allotments Act, 1887," any land by purchase or on lease or any other tenancy, and how many acres have been so acquired by each Authority, and how many allotment tenants hold such land as tenants of each Authority?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HIL, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I am unable to give the information for without obtaining Returns from our Local Sanitary Authorities. The hon. Gentleman, no doubt, desires to obtain information as to the total number of allotments provided since the passing of the Act of 1887; but the Return so desired would not give the information sought for, as by far the greater number of allotments have been obtained by voluntary agreement between owners of land and the labourers. My right hon. Friend the President of the Agricultural Department is considering the desirability of obtaining a Return which will include the information desired by the hon. Gentleman, as well as the particulars of the total number of allotments, and I think, will meet the wishes of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. COBB: May I ask the Minister of Agriculture when he thinks that the Return will be ready?

MR. CHAPLIN: I am afraid not in three or four months.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): Coming out of the question of the Member for the Rugby Division, I would ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can see his way to accepting the motion I have put on the Paper for a Return including the Urban Authorities, as I have accidentally omitted?

MR. RITCHIE: I thought in all probability that what it was desired to do was to obtain information as to the total number of allotments which are in the possession of labourers, and the Return which my right hon. Friend is considering, I believe, to be more acceptable to the hon. Gentleman than the extremely partial Return for which he has moved.

MR. CHANNING: I would ask the hon. Gentleman whether he is not anxious as we are to obtain information as to the acquisition of land under the specific Act passed for that purpose by the House of Commons?

MR. RITCHIE: I attach no importance whatever as to whether or not allotments were provided by the action of the Sanitary Authority; but we do attach importance to it that allotments should be obtained, and I point out to the hon. Gentleman the object of the Allotments Act

was to provide machinery for obtaining them, if owners of land could not themselves enter into voluntary arrangement with the labourers who desired to have them.

MR. CHANNING: Do I understand that the form of Return I have moved for is definitely refused by Her Majesty's Government?

MR. RITCHIE: I shall be very glad to have some conversation with the hon. Gentleman on the subject; but considering that that would be a very partial Return, I am pointing out that it would by no means show the operation of the Act of 1887.

MR. COBB: Let me quite understand. Will the right hon. Gentleman, before the Return of the Minister of Agriculture, which will take three or four months, is produced, give us a smaller Return of the number of allotments acquired under the Act, not compulsorily, but voluntarily since 1887?

MR. RITCHIE: The answer to the question of the hon. Gentleman is covered by my reply to the hon. Member for Northamptonshire.

#### THE DEATH OF JAMES CHOULES.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now able to lay upon the Table the Report of Major Marindin, and the Correspondence with the Midland and South Western Railway Company, relating to the death of James Choules, who was killed on the 16th of October last?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am still in communication with the Company, whom I have asked for certain Returns which I think will insure a proper understanding of the matter, and I hope no great delay will take place in laying the Report and Correspondence on the Table.

MR. CHANNING: May I ask whether it is proposed to lay the Papers before the Select Committee on Railway Hours?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Certainly: they will be laid on the Table, and the Committee will have them.

#### OVERCROWDING ON RAILWAYS.

MR. J. WILSON (Lanark, Govan): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what power, if any, the Board of

Trade possesses to restrain Railway Companies from overcrowding their first and second class carriages with passengers who pay only third class fare?

**SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH:** The only statutory provision which, as far as I am aware, deals with the matter referred to by the hon. Member is contained in a byelaw applicable to all Railway Companies which enacts that—

“Any passenger persisting in entering a carriage or compartment of a carriage containing the full number of persons which it is constructed to convey, when any such person objects to his so entering the carriage or compartment, is hereby subjected to a penalty not exceeding 40s.”

It would not, however, be the duty of the Board of Trade to prosecute in such a case.

#### THE TUBERCULOSIS COMMISSION.

**MR. PARKER SMITH** (Lanark, Partick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can say when the Commission appointed to inquire into the question of tuberculosis will be prepared to report?

**MR. RITCHIE:** I have not yet received the information for which I have asked on this subject. As soon as I receive it I shall be happy to reply to the Question.

#### CASE OF CRUELTY AT HELSTON.

**MR. NORRIS** (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to a case of cruelty at Helston, in Cornwall, where, as reported, a Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe was charged and found guilty of very gross ill-treatment to her step-daughter, consisting of strapping her to a beam, beating her with a whip, and other cruelties, and for which the only penalty inflicted by the local Magistrate was a fine of £10; and if he will state whether any further proceedings can be taken in the matter?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** Yes, Sir; I have received a Report from the Magistrate's clerk referring to this case. It appears that the defendant was convicted of beating her step-daughter, and that, inasmuch as she elected to be dealt with summarily, the Magistrate fined her £10 and costs, or in default two months' imprisonment with hard labour, and he ordered the custody of the girl to be given to her uncle. I am informed that

*Mr. J. Wilson*

the Court would have inflicted a punishment had they been satisfied the other acts of cruelty which alleged had, in fact, been practised the girl. The law does not admit further proceedings being taken in the matter.

#### THE WASHINGTON MARITIME CONFERENCE.

**MR. GOURLEY** (Sunderland): to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any and what proposals have been made with regard to the recommendations of the Washington International Maritime Conference?

**\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH:** Many of the recommendations of the Washington Maritime Conference already provided for by British Regulations, and with regard to such as the Rule of the Road at Sea, International Code of Signals, and Load Line, I am still in communication with Foreign Governments. The subject of a uniform classification of lights is under the consideration of the Lighthouse Authorities, and I have already presented to Parliament a Report of the Committee I appointed to advise upon the efficient bulkheads of ships, and this Report is now being considered by the Board of Trade. With regard to the recommendations of the Conference on the subject of a “uniform system of Buoys and Beacons” a Conference has recently been held, at the suggestion, at the Trinity House, the Presidency of H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, to deliberate upon the proposals made at Washington, and to advise the Board of Trade what steps Britain should take in regard to that Conference has made its Report, which I propose to lay on the Table at an early date. The recommendations contained in it have been communicated to the Foreign Governments represented at Washington.

#### HAULBOWLINE DOCK.

**DR. TANNER** (Cork Co., Midleton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if the channel excavated by the floating dock at Haulbowline a deep water river channel is now proposed, and, if so, what is the greatest draft there obtainable at ordinary high water for permitting the passage of

whether it is now possible to dock any first-class armoured vessel; if it is true that leakage still occurs into the dry dock in Haulbowline Dockyard; what has been the total amount of money spent upon the construction and the equipment of this dockyard; and what is the character of the dockyard work for which this yard has been built?

**LORD GEORGE HAMILTON:** The channel between the dock at Haulbowline and the deep water river channel is clear, and the depth obtainable at ordinary high water spring tides is not less than 26 feet 9 inches. This will allow all but the heaviest ironclads to be docked. At high water neap (or low) tides the depth of water would be 2 feet 6 inches less, or 24 feet 3 inches. The dolphins now being erected at the entrance of the channel will be completed by 31st March, and additional dredging will then be carried out. Water still leaks into the dry dock, but there is nothing unusual in this, as leakage occurs in every dock of the same kind. The total expenditure upon works in this dockyard up to the present time has been about £611,900, including £8,900 for machinery. The character of the work for which the dockyard has been established is primarily the repair of Her Majesty's ships in an emergency.

**DR. TANNER:** May I ask the noble Lord whether it is not the fact that, having in view the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty in 1875, that Haulbowline Dock was to be used for the construction of ships, the present Government are going back upon the undertaking given by a late Conservative Administration, and that this yard is to be used, according to the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, merely for the repair of gunboats?

**LORD G. HAMILTON:** No; I never understood that a pledge was given to make this a building yard, and it certainly has not been so constructed.

**DR. TANNER:** I would call the attention of the noble Lord to a statement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty in 1875, in reply to a question addressed to him from these Benches.

#### STATE PENSIONS.

**COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT:** I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, having regard to the statements laid  
VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

before the country of the extent of old age pauperism among the industrial classes, and to the circumstance that the Committee on National Provident Insurance, presided over by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtownshire, was "practically narrowed into an examination of one particular scheme, that formulated by Canon Blackley," the Government will assent to the early appointment of a Royal Commission or Select Committee to ascertain the facts, and the best means of remedying the evil, and enabling the thrifty to secure State guaranteed pensions in old age upon easy terms, through friendly societies or otherwise?

**THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.):** In answer to my hon. Friend, I have to say that although it is true that Canon Blackley's scheme of national insurance was the only one examined very minutely by the Committee named in the question, because it appeared to be the only one worked out in sufficient detail to make the examination necessary, the Committee collected a vast amount of information that would have to be taken into account in the consideration of any scheme that might be presented to the public. I do not think it will be expedient to appoint a Select Committee, which would have to traverse the ground already traversed by the Committee which sat two years ago.

#### THE SAVINGS BANK ACT, 1891.

**MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe):** I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will lay upon the Table for distribution the scheme of appointment of an Inspection Committee under "The Savings Banks Act, 1891," and append thereto the names of the members appointed?

**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square):** I shall be very glad to comply with the hon. Member's suggestion.

#### IRREGULARITIES IN THE POST OFFICE.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury):** I beg to ask the Postmaster General can he state the number of postal officials dismissed for irregularities last year; the number sent for trial and  
2 O



convicted; what guarantee for honesty is exacted from postal officials in this country; and whether he has copies of the guarantees demanded from postal employees against dishonesty by Indian and Australian Governments?

SIR J. FERGUSSON: The number of postal officials dismissed for irregularities last year was 227. The offences included drunkenness, insubordination, and persistent neglect of duty, as well as acts of fraud. The number sent for trial and convicted was 60. These numbers, out of a total employed of 117,989, amount to about 1 in 520. The guarantees for honesty enacted from Post Office servants are bonds of an approved guarantee society or of private sureties. The Post Office is not in possession of the guarantees used by Indian and Australian Governments. I should like to add that while the proportion of dishonest persons in the service of the Post Office is shown to be very small, I have seen with concern the number of cases which have occurred, and I have taken some steps, and I have others in contemplation, whereby the opportunities and temptations to dishonesty may be diminished.

#### INSUFFICIENTLY STAMPED LETTERS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the high charge or fine, often amounting to double the deficiency, imposed on the recipients of letters insufficiently stamped; and whether he has made any recommendation to the Treasury on the subject?

SIR J. FERGUSSON: Letters unpaid or insufficiently prepaid are, not in this country alone, but throughout the Postal Union, subject to a charge upon delivery equal to double the deficiency. It is not quite accurate to call the whole of this charge a "fine," as one-half of it represents postage which the sender has omitted to pay. There has been no recommendation to the Treasury on the subject.

#### HAROLD'S CROSS POST OFFICE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that the recent closing of the Harold's Cross Post Office has resulted in great inconvenience to the neighbourhood, and how soon the office is likely to be re-opened?

*Mr. Henniker Heaton*

SIR J. FERGUSSON: The submaster of Harold's Cross (Dublin) signed on the 15th ultimo, and necessary steps for the revision of salary were at once taken, as well as finding a suitable successor. The office will be re-opened as soon as the appointment has been made, but I say how soon that will be.

#### IRISH RECEIVERSHIPS.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Captain O'Connor, of the Palace, Elphin, and now a director of *Freeman's Journal*, limited, is described as a receiver under the Land Judgments Act, 1881, in a book compiled and edited by Mr. Den, Q.C., and another member of the Irish Bar; whether Captain O'Connor has been appointed to this office, and whether the practice in such matters for the person desiring to be appointed is to send in a notification of his willingness to act?

MR. MADDEN: I am informed that the gentleman mentioned in the question was entered on the Judges' List in 1889 as suitable for the appointment of Receiver, but has not been appointed to this date. I am also informed that it is not necessary for a gentleman's name to be on the list to send in an application.

MR. BLANE: Did this gentleman apply for the situation himself?

MR. MADDEN: It is inaccurately described as a "situation." The places on the list are certain gentlemen whom he considers suitable to act. It is not necessary that any application be sent in by the gentlemen so named, and the gentleman whose name is mentioned in the question, as a matter of fact, has not been put in charge of any particular office.

#### FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. DARLING (Deptford): I beg to be permitted to draw the attention of the President of the Board of Agriculture to a question of which I have notice with reference to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, inquiring whether he has seen the resolution of the Chamber of Agriculture, recommending that cattle should only be allowed to be landed in this country at the 1

animals wharf for immediate slaughter; and if, in view of the serious outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which has already taken place, he is prepared to act upon that suggestion?

COLONEL DAWNAY (York, N.R., Thirsk): I beg to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is true that the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease was brought into this country in a cargo of raw hides landed at Harwich from a German port and whether steps are being taken to prevent the importation of raw hides from infected countries?

MR. CHAPLIN: In reply to the last question of my hon. and gallant Friend, I can only say that so far as I know there is not the slightest foundation for the rumour to which he has alluded. I have not therefore taken any steps at present to prohibit the importation of raw hides, and, so far as I can learn, they are imported under conditions that almost preclude the risk of infection. But the question is now under my consideration, and if I am satisfied that there is any danger whatever to be apprehended from the importation of raw hides their importation will be prohibited immediately. The question of my hon. Friend the Member for Deptford (Mr. Darling) divides itself into two parts. In a notice which I have just received from him he asks me if it is true that the Board of Agriculture has agreed to allow cattle within the Metropolitan area to be removed from licensed premises to be slaughtered within two days. Well, Sir, no order that I am aware of to that effect has been issued by the Board. I have had to consider a great number of orders within the last few days, but I am unable to charge my memory with any such order. But I have been informed within the last few minutes, since I came into the House, that the London County Council have passed an order empowering their veterinary inspectors to grant licences for the removal of fat cows from cowsheds, from which their removal would be otherwise prohibited, to be slaughtered within two days. If I may be allowed to do so, I should like to take this opportunity of offering one word of caution against some statements which have appeared in the Press in this subject. I noticed yesterday an article in a Sunday paper calculated to excite grave alarm in the minds of the agricultural community, the greater part

of which, so far as I know, was entirely without foundation.

MR. DARLING: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the question I asked. It was, whether he had seen the recommendation of the Bucks Chamber of Agriculture, that cattle should not be allowed to be landed at all in this country except at the foreign animals wharf for immediate slaughter, and whether he is prepared to act on that recommendation?

MR. CHAPLIN: I beg the pardon of my hon. Friend, but I had forgotten that part of his question. I have not received any official intimation of that resolution, but I have seen it, and what I have to say at present upon the question of imposing any further restrictions upon the extremely limited number of animals still allowed to be imported from the Continent of Europe is, that it is a proceeding which ought not to be taken except upon serious consideration, and I do not think it is a question which I ought to be asked to decide at a moment's notice.

#### THE DEATH OF MARY HELEN MONTAGU.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to an inquest, held on the 15th inst., touching the death of Mary Helen Montagu, aged three years, daughter of Robert Acheson Cromie Montagu, J.P., Portstewart, Coleraine, Ireland, in which the Coroner's jury returned the following verdict:—

"That the deceased, Mary Helen Montagu, died from asphyxia. We further say that Annie Margaret Montagu did feloniously kill and slay the said Mary Helen Montagu by binding her body with a stocking, and fastening her when thus tied by a cord to a ring in a dark room at Cronmore House, townland of Ballylease, and parish of Agherton, on the 13th day of February, 1892;"

whether he is aware that Mrs. Montagu acknowledged on oath before the Coroner that she bound the arms and limbs of her child, and caused its death by hanging, as set out in the verdict; that Mrs. Montagu was returned for trial to the Assizes, and bail accepted for her appearance; and that she has since left the country to evade trial; what were the reasons why the police did not arrest Mrs. Montagu, and proceed by deposi-

tions before a Magistrate; and whether he proposes to take any, and what, action to investigate the conduct of the police authorities in the matter?

\*MR. JACKSON: The woman was arrested by the police, and dealt with by the Magistrates in Petty Sessions, and committed for trial.

MR. P. O'BRIEN: That is no answer to my question. Why did the police not arrest her till a week after the offence, and, also, does the right hon. Gentleman intend to take any notice of the conduct of the police?

MR. JACKSON: There is no necessity for such action. No irregularity has taken place.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR GEORGE O. TREVELYAN (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I should like to ask the First Lord of the Treasury after what hour he will not take the Bill for the application and distribution of the grant to Scotland, and also whether he has noticed that the Scotch Bill has been moved from the first place on the Paper, and there are now two other Bills in front of it, and if he will take into consideration the convenience of Scotch Members in the matter?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I thought the Scotch Members would have preferred discussing the Bill when they have it in their hands. This is a matter on which there has been much discussion among Members in all parts of the House, and the proposals which my right hon. and learned Friend will lay before the House are of great interest; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not resist the Bill being read a first time to-night, as the sooner it is read a first time the sooner it will be printed and in the hands of Members.

SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give me an hour after which the Bill will not be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be taken after half-past 11 o'clock. If it be taken by that time, it will give ample time for my right hon. Friend to explain the Bill to the House.

MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): May I ask when the First Lord of the Treasury will make a general statement as to the business during the next few days; and

*Mr. P. O'Brien*

when the Irish Estimates will be as this would be for the convenience of Irish Members?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope on Thursday next if we are able to trust we shall be, to introduce the Budget Bill which is put down on the table to-night, we shall take the Supplementary Estimates; and if they are got together as I think they might be, in the evening of Monday next, we shall take the Indian Councils Bill which will come down from the Lords to which is very urgently required which will no doubt require so much discussion. As the hon. Member there will be a good deal of business to get through at this time of the year, the Bill, other than the Indian Bill which I desire to press forward, the Bill which will be introduced first by my right hon. Friend the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DILLON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will, on Thursday or Monday, make a more general statement as to the course of business, especially in regard to the Irish Estimates? It would be a great convenience to Irish Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Thursday.

#### THE COUNT OUT.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, C): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in regard to the count out on Friday, whether the first Order of Supply was the introduction of the Education and Local Taxation (Scotland) Bill? What I wish to know is whether he is not aware of the principle laid down by successive Governments of the House—Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, and the late Mr. Disraeli—was that it was the duty of the Government to keep a House open all night, and I will ask why the Government allowed the House to be counted out at a quarter before 8 when they had enough of their supporters to keep a House, and when their own business of such importance to Scotland and Ireland, as the Private Bill of the Bill stood next on the Paper, had a chance of getting them on at a late hour in the evening?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has put to me a particular question and a general question. The particular one is, why on last

1. What is the purpose of the study?  
 2. What are the research objectives?  
 3. What is the research design?  
 4. What are the variables?  
 5. What is the sample size?  
 6. What are the data sources?  
 7. What are the data collection methods?  
 8. What are the data analysis methods?  
 9. What are the results?  
 10. What are the conclusions?  
 11. What are the limitations?  
 12. What are the recommendations?

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA) and the *New England Journal of Medicine* (NEJM). The *JAMA* is a weekly journal, while the *NEJM* is a weekly journal. The *JAMA* is published by the American Medical Association, and the *NEJM* is published by the Massachusetts Medical Society. Both journals are highly respected and are considered to be among the top medical journals in the world. The *JAMA* is a general medical journal, while the *NEJM* is a specialty journal focusing on internal medicine. Both journals publish original research, clinical trials, and reviews of the literature. The *JAMA* is a peer-reviewed journal, while the *NEJM* is not. The *JAMA* is a free journal, while the *NEJM* is a paid journal. The *JAMA* is a journal of the American Medical Association, and the *NEJM* is a journal of the Massachusetts Medical Society. Both journals are highly respected and are considered to be among the top medical journals in the world. The *JAMA* is a general medical journal, while the *NEJM* is a specialty journal focusing on internal medicine. Both journals publish original research, clinical trials, and reviews of the literature. The *JAMA* is a peer-reviewed journal, while the *NEJM* is not. The *JAMA* is a free journal, while the *NEJM* is a paid journal. The *JAMA* is a journal of the American Medical Association, and the *NEJM* is a journal of the Massachusetts Medical Society.

the 1990s, the number of people in the world who are illiterate has increased from 1.2 billion to 1.5 billion. The number of illiterate people in the world is projected to increase to 1.7 billion by the year 2015. The number of illiterate people in the world is projected to increase to 1.7 billion by the year 2015. The number of illiterate people in the world is projected to increase to 1.7 billion by the year 2015.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

TO THE NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK, NEW YORK  
FROM THE NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK, NEW YORK  
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE IS A TRUE AND CORRECT  
COPY OF THE ORIGINAL AS THE SAME APPEARS IN THE  
RECORDS OF THE NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK, NEW YORK  
IN WITNESS WHEREOF I HAVE HEREUNTO SET MY HAND AND  
THE SEAL OF THE NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK, NEW YORK  
THIS 10TH DAY OF MAY, 1964.

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to recognize that a problem exists. This is often done by comparing current performance with a desired state or goal. If there is a discrepancy, a problem is identified.

2. Once a problem is identified, the next step is to define the problem more precisely. This involves determining the scope of the problem, the resources available, and the constraints that may be affecting the problem.

3. The third step is to analyze the problem. This involves identifying the causes of the problem and determining the relationships between different factors. This step is often the most difficult, as it requires a deep understanding of the problem and the ability to think critically.

4. The fourth step is to develop a solution. This involves brainstorming different ideas and evaluating them based on their feasibility, effectiveness, and cost. The goal is to find a solution that addresses the problem in a way that is sustainable and meets the needs of all stakeholders.

5. The final step is to implement the solution. This involves putting the solution into action and monitoring its progress. It is important to have a plan for how to implement the solution and to have a way to measure its success. Once the solution is implemented, it is important to evaluate its effectiveness and make any necessary adjustments.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[illegible]

I said that I hoped to have it printed in the first half of this week, by Thursday at latest, and I trust before.

#### NEW WRITS ISSUED.

Derbyshire, Southern Division, *v.* Henry Wardle, esq., deceased; Surrey, Chertsey Division, *v.* F. A. Hankey, esq., deceased.

#### INDIAN COUNCILS ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL. [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 182.]

#### MOTIONS.

#### SMALL AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

##### LEAVE. FIRST READING.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Mr. Speaker, it now becomes my duty to submit to the House the proposals of the Government for giving effect to the paragraph in the Gracious Speech from the Throne which referred to the question of small holdings of land in the agricultural districts of the country, and I commence by saying this at once, that the proposals I am about to make being, as I believe they are, entirely novel to our legislation, must be necessarily of a somewhat tentative character, and the Bill I shall lay on the Table, if the House approve is more or less of the nature of an experiment, which the Government have decided, after full consideration, that it is right and expedient to make. One of the chief objects which we have in view is a wider distribution of the land among the people of this country; to bring back upon the soil, if it be possible by legislation—I had almost said to re-create, if I may use the term—a class of the community which has been gradually dwindling for many years, and which is now rapidly becoming extinct, but which, at the same time, we must remember, existed, and not only existed, but flourished, in former days in far greater numbers than is the case at present, and which I am persuaded that

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

all sections of the House would desire, if possible, to see maintained. I am speaking now, Sir, of the class which used to be described as yeomen, or, in other words, the owners of small properties in land. That is an object which must thoroughly commend itself not only to gentlemen sitting on this side, but also to gentlemen sitting on that side of the House, and which is most thoroughly in accord with all the traditions of the Party to which they belong. Indeed, I think, Sir, I have only to mention the name of Mr. Bright, whose views on this subject were so well and so widely known, and which he has so often defended with his unrivalled eloquence in this House, to carry the unanimous assent of hon. Gentlemen opposite in the assertion I make. Sir, I cannot doubt that, whatever may be thought of the means which I shall propose to-night in order to give effect to our views, all Parties in the House will agree that the object is one which is deserving of support, and that the experiment which we propose is one which it is desirable to make. Among other reasons which have guided us in our decision, I will begin by mentioning to the House one in particular. No one who is well acquainted with the agricultural districts of the country can fail to be aware of the constant migration of the rural population from the country to the towns, which has been so prominent and so unwelcome a feature of the rural situation during the last few years, and which I am afraid is still progressing, and perhaps at an ever-accelerated pace, to-day. There are various reasons which may possibly account for it. For instance, there is the great increase of education, which of late years has taken place in the country districts as well as in the towns, and which many people think has given rise to a growing distaste for actual labour on the soil, especially when that labour is employed under conditions which, in the opinion of the workers themselves, gives no sufficient opening for the improvement of their lot and their position in the future, especially when old age begins to advance upon them. Again, Sir, there are the higher wages which can be so easily obtained for labour in the towns, and the generally greater attractions which are offered to the life of the labouring man who dwells in the city as compared with the life of the man who lives upon

the land. And, thirdly, there is the great and constantly increasing demand for active and intelligent labour in numerous walks of life, such as on railways, in the Police Force of the country, and various other works, which will readily occur to hon. Members, which are all eagerly sought for by the youngest and smartest members of the rural population, and which, not unnaturally, I am bound to say, I think they infinitely prefer to the comparative dullness and drudgery of the labours in which they are engaged in the country. These are all causes which it seems to me, at all events, may partly account for the tendency which, in my humble judgment, is nothing but an evil to all parties whom it concerns. It is bad for the labourers themselves, because they constantly take their labour to markets which they find already congested, and where they can only obtain work by reducing the wages of their fellow-workmen, or, as only too commonly happens, they fail to find employment at all. It is bad for the owners and occupiers of land, and for the land itself, which constantly suffers from the want of sufficient labour being employed on it: and it is bad for the community at large, because of the lesser amount of produce which the land yields. And that, Sir, being so, the question naturally arises whether there is nothing which can be done, whether there is not something that we can do by legislation to aid in arresting a process which is so injurious to all? Well, Sir, the Government think that there is, and that one of the measures which is likely to have some effect, and probably considerable effect, in this direction, is to afford to the rural population, whose labour at the present time, apart from their wages, is dependent on the land directly in the interests and for the profit of others, some greater facilities than they enjoy at present for sometimes working on the land in their own interest, and for the profit of themselves. We believe that in doing this we shall be taking a step which is not only in the interests of the labourers, but greatly also in the interests of the farmers as well, and I say so for this reason. The greatest danger I see ahead for the farmers of this country, and the agricultural interest generally, at the present moment, is not so much the increase of foreign competition, of

which I think myself—although I speak on this subject in most guarded accents—we may, perhaps, have seen the worst, not so much in a future fall in the prices of agricultural produce, but in the great and growing difficulty of finding sufficient labour for the effective cultivation of the land; and in anything we can do in this respect to lessen and remove that difficulty and so retain the labour on the land, I believe we shall be conferring on the farmers of this country one of the greatest benefits in our power. For, in the first place, what I wish to point out is this—in the case of men who occupy small holdings, who may be the future occupants of small holdings—it does not necessarily follow that the whole of their time will be engaged; on the contrary, I believe there will always be times and seasons when part of their labour will be available for service on the larger farms in the vicinity. And, in the second place, the mere possibility of being able to obtain for himself, by his own industry and thrift in the future, a small holding for his own purposes will, I believe, be no small inducement to the younger labourers to remain in the country in far greater numbers than they do at present. Well, Sir, there is another reason which has always had considerable weight with me. So far as I can observe, there is a widespread and general desire that at least the experiment should be tried. I am sure it is the case—and I am speaking from my own personal knowledge—among the labourers themselves, although I believe it to be of comparatively recent growth. It is very natural and very easily explained, and I attribute it to two causes: In the first place, the lower wages which in the past few years they have been in the habit of receiving since the agricultural depression has weighed so heavily on the farmers, and there is also the almost constant want of employment to which they have always been subject in recent years, especially in the winter months, the very time when good and regular employment is of more importance to them than at any other; and, secondly, Mr. Speaker, I attribute it to the great increase in the number of allotments which has followed the passing of the Acts which became law a year or two ago. I know perfectly well that it is a regular Party shibboleth on that side of the House,

that the Allotments Acts passed by the present Government have been shams and failures, and especially on country platforms. A right hon. Gentleman on that Bench made that statement not many nights ago, not on a country platform, but on a platform in one of the City constituencies. What I have to say on that point is that these gentlemen know as well as I know—and if they do not know they ought to—that they are absolutely contradicted by the facts. Those Acts have had precisely the effect that I always hoped and expected they would have. They have been the means, either directly or indirectly, of providing allotments for thousands and thousands of labouring men throughout all parts of England who never knew what it was to have the enjoyment of allotments before; and what is more, in the great majority of cases, they have attained it by what I have always maintained, and always shall maintain, to be the easiest and the most convenient mode, namely, by friendly and voluntary arrangements with the owners of the land. I know scores of instances which have come under my notice during the present year where men with a single acre for an allotment, or sometimes with even less, have been able to make a profit out of the land for themselves of sums which ranged, as I am told on very good authority, from £5 to £8, and where in one case, I am informed, of as much as £10 in the year; and having been so extremely successful with their small allotments, and having had this experience of the profits which they can make from little plots of land, they are naturally anxious to see what they can do with more. How far they are right in the desire to exchange a small plot for a holding of a larger and different description remains to be proved. I never had a doubt upon the question of allotments. I knew, I was always certain, that it could only be an unmixed good for the rural population; but no one can speak with equal certainty upon the question of small holdings. There is a wide and a clear distinction between them. Neither capital nor buildings are required in the case of allotments, except in the case of the pig-sty, which generally goes with the cottage; but it is these very questions of capital and buildings which constitute our chief difficulty in dealing satisfac-

*Mr. Chaplin*

torily with the question of small holdings. As to the cultivation of the holdings—I judge from what I have seen of their allotments—I have not the slightest misgiving whatever; and in dairy countries, with which I am better acquainted to say I am not altogether so acquainted as I am with other agricultural parts of the country—there, I understand, all the information which reaches me, the system of small holdings has already been established and proved to be a success. Sir, it is a very common thing in districts where there are numerous allotments, to give prizes for the allotments which are cultivated the best—it is usual from among the large farmers in the neighbourhood that the Judge selects one or two allotments, and many a large farmer, some of whom I know well, have told me they have been perfectly astonished to see the admirable manner in which the small land was cultivated. Well, I venture to think that is very encouraging to those who are seeking to bring about an extension of this operation upon a wider and a broader scale; and I think the House will agree with me in this, that it is clearly true that if a man has been eminently successful in the cultivation of one acre of land, it is a fair and reasonable presumption that he is likely to be successful in the cultivation of more. I frankly own that I arrived at this opinion in the light of new experience that I was formerly opposed to attempt to establish by law a system of small holdings; and further, I had no belief at all in the probability of success of any such system; and I am bound to say that the opportunity which I have had in former years of seeing the results of that system in counties where it is already established were more than ample warrant, more than ample justification for my opinion. I remember visiting a district in the north east part of the county which I represent, and that many years ago—a district which was cultivated entirely under such a system. I do not remember exactly, but I think it must have been some 10 or 15 years ago; at all events, it was at a time when the agricultural depression was at its height—some three or four years before it had commenced—and I am bound to say this, that a more lamentable and a more deplorable spectacle of agricultural depression and disaster it never was my misfor-

to witness. It made a deep impression upon me at the time, and that impression was confirmed by the evidence which was received by the Richmond Commission. But I am inclined to believe—indeed, I am confident from inquiries which I subsequently made, and from inquiries which I have more recently thought it my duty to make—that in one respect, at all events, we were at that time very insufficiently informed. We did not realise at all—it was not put before us; I do not know if even the information was attainable, because upon that point the people were most reticent themselves—we did not realise at all the extravagant prices which had been given for the land. The holdings of which I am speaking were acquired at a time when the prices of agricultural produce were probably at their highest; when the condition of agriculture in consequence was one of great prosperity; when the tendency of land was to continually increase in value, and when it was sought for, and eagerly bought by the population of those districts at prices which, in relation to its present value, would be twice and sometimes three times as much as it was worth. Consequently, when the bad times came—commencing as they did with a succession of two or three of the worst seasons in the memory of man, and followed by a sudden and almost unparalleled fall in the price of agricultural produce—these poor people, over whose farms I walked myself, and whose condition I had every opportunity of seeing, were ruined, one after another, in hundreds of cases. I am informed, however, that a large amount of the land in those districts since those days has changed hands again, and of course at a greatly reduced price; and where that has been the case, where that has been done, there I understand the cultivation of these holdings has been carried on, and is being carried on to-day, with very different results. That being so, and in view of the greatly altered circumstances of the times, of the greatly reduced price at which land can be obtained at present; and lastly, but not least, in view of the admirable cultivation of numbers of allotments by the labouring population in the counties, I have come to the deliberate conclusion that there is no reason whatever at the present time why, even upon economic grounds, the experiment may not

be tried with a fair and reasonable prospect of success; and as to its advantages upon social grounds, I hardly think there will be any difference of opinion. Now, Sir, having stated the general views of the Government upon this question, I think the House will probably be anxious to know something as to the means by which we propose to carry them into effect; and I will endeavour, as briefly and as clearly as I can, to explain to the House the provisions of the Bill which I propose to lay upon the Table of the House to-night. The scheme of the Bill, generally speaking, is as follows:—The Public Works Loan Commissioners, that is to say, the State, are empowered to lend at a rate of interest that is not to exceed  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and the Local Authority are empowered, either from them or elsewhere, if they prefer it, to borrow money in order to acquire land for the purpose of providing small holdings for persons who are resident in the county in which the land is acquired, and who will themselves cultivate the holdings. But, in view of the fact that this is avowedly an experiment, we have thought it right to proceed with due caution in the first instance; and following the recommendation of the Select Committee on Small Holdings upon this point, we limit the borrowing powers of the Local Authority as follows:—The amount to be borrowed is not to exceed a sum which would involve a charge upon the rates, exceeding for any one year one penny in the pound. It will naturally be asked, what is a small holding? And a small holding as defined in the Bill means this: it means land which is suitable for agriculture, and exceeds an acre, and either does not exceed 50 acres or is of an annual value not exceeding £50. The Local Authority being the instrument for giving effect to our scheme, we have had to consider upon what area it will be that the charge upon the rates should be levied. The House is aware there is more than one Local Authority in existence at present. But although we hope, and we confidently expect while we remain a Government, to carry proposals in the future, for the provisions both of District Councils and also of Parochial Reform, yet, unfortunately, it is the case, that we have only one popularly elected body at present, and that is the County Council.



Now, the House is aware that as regards allotments there is precedent for the acquisition of land by the Guardians, and for the management of the land by Parish Authorities. But although I have adopted, as the House will see directly, some of the provisions which are afforded by this precedent, I have not adopted them entirely, and I have abstained from doing so for this reason—I have made some calculations as to what the borrowing powers at the rate of 1d. in the £1 will impose, and this investigation has made it quite clear that in the case of parishes it would absolutely be beyond their power, and even in the case of Unions I doubt if their resources would be anything like adequate for the purpose. In view, therefore, of these considerations, and also of the fact that the County Council is the only elected body at the present time, we have come to the conclusion that the County Council is the proper and fitting authority for the purpose of acquiring land to be devoted to small holdings. And I may mention that the amount which the rate of 1d. in the £1 would produce in England and Scotland on the County Rate, exclusive of London and of the county boroughs, would in round numbers, roughly speaking, amount to something like £10,000,000. The County Council having been invested with these powers, the next thing to consider was the means of putting them in motion, and accordingly it is provided in the Bill that every County Council, not being a Council of a borough, who may do so if they please, shall appoint a committee for the purpose of putting the Act into operation; and, secondly, upon a petition being presented by one or more county electors, upon reasonable and *bona fide* grounds the committee shall cause inquiry to be made, who shall report the result of their inquiry to the Council. Assuming that the report of the committee is in favour of the petition, the next stage in the process is the acquisition of the land. How is it to be acquired? Is it to be by purchase? Is it to be by hire? Or is it to be by both? I grant that this is a question which is deserving of very careful consideration; and I own I was much taken at first sight by a proposal made during the Recess by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian—namely, that the Local Authorities, in addition to powers

Mr. Chaplin

to buy the land, should have power to take it upon hire as well. But on looking more carefully into this proposal I found that there were numerous objections, which prevented my adopting it in the Bill. In the first place, the House will see at once that if the land was only hired by the County Council it could not be sold, and that would have been contrary to all the evidence and to all the recommendations of the Select Committee on Small Holdings, all of which went to show that ownership was preferable to tenancy. In the second place, you would at once convert the Local Authority into a middleman, an institution which has always been regarded as exceedingly objectionable, and which I think there is no reason whatever to revive. In the third place, if you make the Local Authority into a landlord the risk would be far greater to the ratepayers, and the Local Authorities must take all the chances and all the vicissitudes of the position of a landlord. For instance, in bad times, the first thing that would happen would be this, that the Local Authority would be subjected to great pressure to reduce the rents. But this could only be done at the cost of the ratepayers. On the other hand, if the reduction were refused they would at once become the most unpopular landlords in the world. Fourthly, it would add very much to the difficulty of providing buildings, a difficulty, in my opinion, which is quite sufficient already. And, lastly, it would defeat what I have already described to the House as one of the main objects of the Bill, which is to add to the number of owners of land. We had, therefore, no hesitation in deciding that the land should be acquired by purchase by the Local Authority, and we also attach this condition to the purchase, namely, that the price to be given is not to exceed what they would reasonably expect to receive for it themselves including expenses when the land is again disposed of for small holdings. We have also considered whether the land should be acquired by agreement only or by compulsory provisions being included in the Bill. Now, I am aware there are ample precedents in our legislation already for the acquisition of land by compulsion for public purposes; but then I am distinctly of opinion that compulsion ought not to be resorted to unless it is clearly shown that

It is necessary, and that the object cannot be obtained without it. But there is no such proof in this case; on the contrary, all the evidence that we have before us points in exactly the opposite direction. There never was a time when there was so much land in the market as there is at present. There are thousands of acres in every direction of the country which owners are only too anxious to get rid of, and only too anxious and willing to sell if they can only find purchasers for the land, and certainly the enormous increase which we have witnessed during the last few years in the number of allotments, most of them acquired by voluntary means, shows that there is no unwillingness on the part of the owners to find the land necessary for these purposes. Moreover, this question was carefully examined by the Select Committee on Small Holdings, and, with the permission of the House, as I know that in some quarters this is regarded as an important point, I will read the following passage from their Report:—

"Your Committee having given full consideration to the arguments upon both sides, have resolved not to recommend compulsory power. They feel that any scheme adopted now must necessarily be tentative, and they are convinced that enough land will be attainable by voluntary agreement to ensure a fair trial for this experiment. They do not think it desirable to alarm landowners by a provision which is unnecessary, and which is not likely at any time to be largely availed of."

I am quite aware that that recommendation of the Committee was not arrived at by a unanimous vote. I find, on referring to the proceedings, that it was arrived at by a majority of 7 to 4; that, later on, they repeated it, and we have no hesitation whatever in adopting, upon this point, the recommendation of that Committee. The House will perceive that we have reached the stage when the Local Authority has become the owner of land, and the next provision is this, that, having bought it, they may then adapt it, by fencing, or whatever means may be most convenient, for the purpose of small holdings—they are then to offer it for sale under the rules laid down in the Bill. If a sale be effected the purchase is to be completed in the course of a month from the time of sale, and upon the completion of the purchase one-fourth of the purchase money is to be paid

down at once. That I regard as a very important provision. In the first place, it gives security at once to the Local Authorities; in the second place, it insures that the man who is able to pay down one-fourth of the purchase money is, in all probability, a man who has been careful, who has been saving, who has been thrifty, and who, therefore, deserves to be encouraged, and who is likely to do well; and, in the next place, it excludes the idle and the worthless who, probably, without this provision, would be the first to make an experiment under the Act. In regard to the remainder of the purchase money; another fourth may be secured by a perpetual rent-charge redeemable at will; and the remaining half is to be paid by instalments, or by terminable annuities, within 50 years, the purchaser being at liberty to pay off the whole of the debt at any time he wishes to do so. So far, although we have been able to make provision for the man who has been able to put by some savings of his own, little has been done for the labourer who is not in that fortunate position, and who is wholly unable to find the means of purchasing a small holding at all. And it is provided that where this is the case, the Local Authority may let small holdings in quantities which are not to exceed 10 acres of land. It is hoped that by this means a ladder may be provided to enable a man, by the exercise of his own industry, in the future to look forward to a time when he may be able to purchase a small holding. I must also point out that in the case of all these holdings—whether they are to be let, or whether they are to be sold—for 10 years in any case, and after 10 years until such time as the whole of the purchase money has been discharged, are to be held under certain conditions, the chief of which are as follows:—In the first place, they must be cultivated by the owner; in the second place, they must not be sub-let, or sub-divided, without the consent of the County Council; thirdly, it is provided that any dwelling-house erected on the holding must comply with the conditions, the sanitary conditions, which are required by the County Council; and then there is a fourth condition which is one of considerable importance, and to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. This provision stipulates that not more than one dwelling-house shall be erected on a holding, and

that no dwelling-house shall be erected at all where the holding is of an annual value not exceeding £25, unless it is sufficient in the opinion of the Council to enable the occupier to maintain in comfort his family and himself by the cultivation of the holding. Now, I think the reasons for this condition will be obvious to the House at once. We are anxious to avoid doing anything in this Bill by which we may be instrumental in creating anything in the nature of congested districts in this country. But the House will see that that provision has also this effect: it divides small holdings into two parts. And with regard to the smaller class of holdings, which are conceived to meet what, in the nature of the case, must be purely local needs and local requirements, we make provision by which the County Council will be enabled to delegate the entire management of the smaller class of holdings to a Committee, which is to be composed partly of County Councillors and partly of allotments managers in the parish in which the land is situated; and if there should be no allotments manager, then to a person, who should be elected as if he were an allotments manager, expressly for the purpose. I am afraid I have wearied the House, but I shall not trouble it very much longer. Now, I come to the most difficult of the questions which we have had to meet in a measure dealing with this subject, and that is the provision of the necessary buildings. In some cases, of course, there would be buildings which are already in existence, which are either suitable or easily capable of being adapted to the purpose; in others, there will be none. Where that is the case, how are they to be provided? By the Local Authority? by the purchaser from his own resources? or by the purchaser with the aid of the Local Authority? It has sometimes been suggested that the Local Authority should advance to the purchaser money for this purpose. With regard to the last of these suggestions, I have been altogether unable to entertain it; and for this reason, that I have found no security whatever that appears to me to be adequate for the purpose. And with regard to the other two alternatives, we are clearly of opinion that the buildings, if possible, ought to be erected by the purchaser. We think they would be

*Mr. Chaplin*

built, under these circumstances, with far more economy, and they would also provide an additional guarantee for the security of the ratepayers in the event, under any circumstances, of the purchaser not being forthcoming with his annual instalments. But, on the other hand, of course, there may be cases where the provision of buildings in addition to the payment of the purchase-money would so seriously encroach on the capital of the purchaser as to seriously cripple him in the cultivation of his holding. Where that is the case we thought it right to make a provision by which, under circumstances of that kind, the Local Authority may provide the buildings themselves as part of the agreement, either for the sale, or the letting of the holding; and I am bound to say myself that, in cases where the land is let, I do not see how the Local Authority can escape from the burden of providing the necessary buildings themselves. I now hope I am coming very near the end of what I am afraid has been a very long story. There is one more provision in the Bill which I must submit to the attention of the House. There may be cases—and very possibly there will be cases—in which the occupying tenant of a small holding may be anxious to buy his occupation from his landlord who may also be perfectly willing and perfectly ready to sell; where that is the case, and where the parties have already come to an agreement upon the subject there the County Council is empowered to lend to the tenant three-fourths of the purchase-money on the security of the holding. If the holding is bought under these circumstances, it becomes at once subject to all the other conditions in respect of small holdings to which I have already referred. But no advance of this kind is to be made unless the County Council is satisfied that the price is reasonable, that the title is good, and that the purchase is made in good faith. And now I think the time has come when I should bring my observations to a close. I am exceedingly grateful to the House for the indulgence with which it has listened to them. I am perfectly well aware of the many imperfections which doubtless will be found in the Bill which I have desired to submit to the consideration of the House. Nor has it been either an easy or a simple matter to formulate proposals on the

subject of this Bill; on the contrary, the difficulties have been great, and they have been all the greater because they are inherent in the nature of the case. We have to deal with conditions, of course, in which it is difficult enough for those who cultivate the soil to hold their own even when the work is done under the most scientific, and under the most economic, conditions. How is it likely, then, to fare with those who enter on this task without the aid of these advantages? Are we justified in hoping and believing that the greater industry which I think we may anticipate, encouraged and inspired by the stimulus of ownership, will more than compensate for the want of these advantages? That is the problem which, in my opinion, only time can solve, and which experience alone will be able to decide. But there is much to encourage us in believing that it will, and this, at least, may, with confidence, be asserted, that there never was a time more favourable for making such an experiment than is the present. Land in the market is very plentiful, and land never was so cheap; and although it is true that at the present moment the prices of agricultural produce are low, yet I believe myself that the prices both of land and produce are more likely to rise in the future than they are to fall. If that be so, and if I am right in my anticipation upon this point, then the small holders in the future will enter on their new career with every hope and every prospect of success, and most sincerely do I hope it may be so. If by any means we can succeed in attaching more closely to the soil the men to whose exertions the wealth it produces is mainly owing, I am persuaded we shall achieve a work which will add not only to the happiness and welfare of the people, but will redound to the credit of the Parliament which will pass the measure into law.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to facilitate the acquisition of Small Agricultural Holdings."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

(5.40.) SIR W. VERNON HARCOURT (Derby): I think the right hon. Gentleman will feel that by the cheers that followed the conclusion of his speech—and it is acknowledged on both sides of the House—he has

discharged an important task with great ability and clearness. I am very glad that in bringing forward his measure, at all events, the right hon. Gentleman did not think it necessary to disparage his own Bill, or assure us that it was one which was not likely to have important consequences. It is impossible, I think, to conceive any measure which is more important in its character, and which, if it succeed, as we all hope it may succeed, will be more beneficial in its effects on this country. Now, of course, what we desire, and what I think the Gentlemen opposite desire also, is that this Bill should be made a thoroughly genuine and workable Bill. I give the right hon. Gentleman, and the Government, full credit for having that intention, and I hope, in the few remarks that I shall have to make upon it, that they will not believe that I am suggesting that there is any other design on the part of the Government. Now, the right hon. Gentleman has said that this is a tentative Bill. Well, I will not quarrel with the adjective. There is no doubt that there are provisions in this Bill—and, in fact, the whole machinery of the measure is necessarily such—somewhat novel in character. There was only one part of the right hon. Gentleman's address which, I think, might have been shortened, and which, indeed, was hardly necessary, when he endeavoured to convince the House that it was a matter of great importance that facilities should be given to attach the labourer to the soil. I can assure him that if there is no difficulty on that side of the House, he will never have any difficulty on this side of the House in bringing us to that conclusion. Indeed, if the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me for saying so, if he is converted on that subject, there will be no one left to be converted. That has always been the creed that we have held, and I am happy to know that he holds that creed in its orthodox form. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken so frankly of the change of opinion that has come over his own mind in this matter, that even if I had been so disposed to advert to former Debates, I should not think of doing so on the present occasion. It was quite worth while that the right hon. Gentleman should occupy the responsible position that he now holds if, by the further knowledge he has acquired, he should

have come to a different conclusion to that which he tells us he at one time entertained. Therefore I think he may take it for granted now, that everybody is agreed that there ought to be a measure for facilitating the creation of small holdings; that everybody is agreed that small holdings are a good thing if they can be acquired; and that, therefore, the objective view is one upon which there is a general concurrence of opinion. Now, of course, we come to the machinery that the right hon. Gentleman has proposed in his Bill, and there, of course, we must expect that there will be a considerable difference of opinion among those who have long had to consider this question. I think the right hon. Gentleman has altered his opinion as to the expediency of small holdings in themselves. He still seems not to have become an absolute convert to the blessed word "compulsion." Well now, Sir, I do not object to the tone in which the right hon. Gentleman has spoken upon that subject, though I differ from the conclusion at which he has arrived. I think all that violence of feeling which at one time raged against the very idea of employing compulsory powers seems to have disappeared. It is natural that it should have disappeared, for compulsion has been employed with great advantage, and, indeed, under an obvious necessity, in a great number of measures cognate to the one now before the House. The right hon. Gentleman admits that, and says:—

"I admit that compulsion has been employed, and might be employed, but there is no necessity in this case."

Now, I should like to remind the right hon. Gentleman of what the course of legislation upon these agricultural subjects has been. He will remember, and the House will remember, the first Bill introduced by the Government of Mr. Disraeli—for compensation for tenants' improvements. At that time it was maintained that compulsion could not be employed, that it was a thing not to be heard of for a moment; and the consequence was that in that Bill a provision was introduced that every landlord, by giving notice, might contract himself out of the Bill. Well, what was the consequence? Why, that almost all the landlords—I might almost say

*Sir W. Vernon Harcourt*

universally—contracted themselves out of the Bill; and the very same Government if I remember right, were compelled to come down and strike that provision out of the Bill, and take away power of voluntary contract in respect of that measure. That is an example of where you believed you could do without compulsion and found that you were mistaken in that belief. The next measure with regard to which we were told compulsion was unnecessary, was in the case of allotments. We were told, "voluntary power is quite sufficient, compulsion is unnecessary." Did you find compulsion unnecessary? Why, in the first Allotments Bill, you were obliged to bring in a second Allotments Bill. And what was the ground alleged? Why, that compulsion was necessary. I think that is a fair account of what happened in the case of allotments; and, therefore, I cannot conclude why the right hon. Gentleman and Government should have come to the conclusion that, having been obliged to resort to it, where compulsion had been dispensed with they can start a new measure as an effective and workable measure when they depart from that principle, which, in other cases, they have been obliged, after experience, to resort to. Now, there is one authority on this subject—and I assure you, Speaker and the Government, that I am not going to cite a quotation from *Hansard* for the purpose of making an attack on anybody, but I am using it as an argument. When the subject of compulsion was under discussion, the position of the right hon. Gentleman in the Debate of 1886 was that small holdings were necessarily, in themselves, evils. That was not the position upon which the Chancellor of the Exchequer relied. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that—he used a very strong expression, to which I will refer. But his objection was, "substitution of the community for individual in the creation of small holdings"—that was his line of argument. And he said, arguing that question that even if that difficulty were removed in order to make the plan a workable plan—the plan recommended by the hon. Member for Ipswich and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham

unless they were to have compulsion, that Bill would be no good at all. I am only using that as an argument against the views taken by the right hon. Gentleman on the subject of compulsion. This is what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said :—

"If there is no compulsion, then the proposal of my right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham will share the fate of the Act of George III."

That was an old Act, where the principle was not admitted, and under which, in point of fact, nothing has ever been done. And the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that if there were no compulsion, that then the measure proposed would share the fate of this obsolete, and, practically-speaking, abortive measure :—

"With the experience of that Act before us, I ask, is it wise to embark afresh on this legislation?"

Then, an hon. Member said, "make it compulsory," and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said :—

"Yes, with compulsion you would do much."

And then he proceeds to say :—

"If compulsion is introduced, well and good; you may run great danger."

That is to say, by adopting the principle of compulsion.

"At the same time, you may give some effect to the proposal."

I give that as an argument in favour of compulsion. It was very well put by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Though he disapproved of the provision being introduced into the measure at all, he pointed out that "without the compulsion the measure would be practically ineffective." I am not proposing to trouble the House at all upon the details as to the manner in which the money is to be advanced, or on what I may call the minor details of this Bill. That, I think, cannot with any great advantage be discussed until we have the Bill before us, and have fuller information on the subject; and I would not myself be a party to inviting the House to go into details of that character. But I touch upon this question of compulsion as a question of what I may call principle in this Bill. Well, there is one other matter which is even more important than the question of compulsion, and that is the body who are to give

effect to this Bill. Now, we have all known in former Bills that, in dealing with allotments, the body that had to put the Act into operation was unsatisfactory. It was unsatisfactory because it really had not the ability to deal with its provisions, and, therefore, to a great degree, the means of carrying it out. In the course of the Debate, when we get into Committee on this measure, we shall have the advantage of Gentlemen who are far better acquainted with the action of County Councils than I can pretend to be myself. But I must say, upon first sight, from what I can learn of the constitution and action of this body, I am by no means satisfied that they are the appropriate machinery for giving effect to such a Bill as this. I give the County Councils all credit for the admirable work that they have done, but they are a large body, who sit in a county town in the centre of the great counties, and they have no knowledge of the details of the localities, and they cannot possibly deal with this matter. Indeed, I could gather from the tone and expressions of the right hon. Gentleman he almost apologised for taking the County Councils, simply because he had got nothing else. The mainspring of this Bill will be the body that is to carry it into execution. I venture to express the opinion, and it is an opinion which I expressed often before, that if you are to do anything in this matter which depends absolutely and entirely upon the local knowledge of the persons interested—you may say, on the whole, people in every parish in the county—you must have your Local Authorities on small details, and unless you get a body of that kind there is no life in this Bill at all. Take the County of Devonshire. We have a body at Exeter trying to come to a determination on the question of the necessity and propriety of small holdings in some districts in that great county. Take the county in which I myself reside—a much smaller county; but I cannot conceive that a County Council sitting at Winchester could possibly enter into the considerations which are vital to the determination of these things. And when you come to consider what will be the character of the work which has to be done—whether Blackacre or Whiteacre is to be bought for this purpose: who is the man in a village who is a solvent man: who is an individual to be

trusted — these are matters which, it seems to me, from what I know of them, it is impossible that a body of the character of a County Council can determine. Before this Bill has the breath of life in it, I think you must have these Local Councils—whether you choose to call them District Councils or Parish Councils. You will then have a body consisting of persons who understand the very limited areas whose wants this Bill is intended to meet. These, it seems to me, are two very important points in this Bill which you will have, when we come to discuss this Bill in Committee, carefully to consider. Now, the right hon. Gentleman spoke upon another point, which I think is a very material one, and that is the hire of land. We fought that out on the Allotments Bill at very considerable length. The right hon. Gentleman seems to have come to a conclusion largely adverse to the principle of hiring land. I hope when that question comes to be argued at further length he will be prepared to modify his views; but I understand now that, as regards the labourers, he is disposed to consider the question, and, as I understand, there are some provisions in the Bill with reference to the hire of land upon a small scale. I therefore think we have made a considerable advance since the time of the Allotments Bill.

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD** (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): There is no provision in the Allotments Bill for the compulsory acquisition of land; but there was for the voluntary acquisition.

**SIR W. HARCOURT**: I hope we shall learn in the course of the discussion what extent of hiring has been employed in the case of allotments. There is another provision which I confess I did not clearly understand, which was the limitation of the buildings for a dwelling-house. As I understand from the right hon. Gentleman no dwelling-house, except by special permission, is to be allowed upon any land under £25 a year.

**MR. CHAPLIN**: Under the value of £25, unless, in the opinion of the County Council, the cultivation of the holding would be sufficient to provide for the maintenance of the man and his family.

*Sir W. Vernon Harcourt*

**SIR W. HARCOURT**: I think are a great many holdings whose value would be under £25. They are numbers, not only under but under £20 and £15, where men living on their own resources, a should be extremely sorry to see right hon. Gentleman put any limit upon these.

**MR. CHAPLIN**: Do I understand that in the view of the right hon. Gentleman there should be no limitation?

**SIR W. HARCOURT**: Certainly anything like to the extent of that is very extreme. I think right hon. Gentleman should take heart and not be afraid of the creation of congested districts in the agricultural provinces of England. The alarm on that subject is altogether unfounded, and very well be dismissed. Now, Sir, I do not desire to delay the House in further discussing this matter. The right hon. Gentleman may be assured that on this side of the House the object he has in heart is one we will be ready to support, and we are quite prepared to go into discussion of this Bill with a heartiness to make it a living and a working measure.

**MR. JEFFREYS** (Hants, Basingstoke): I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture on the introduction of this Bill, which I believe will be a boon to the country residents in general, and will be the means of attracting a large number of people to the land. The objection to the Bill taken by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is that it does not contain the principle of compulsion. I am very glad, in that that principle of compulsion should not come in at the present time, because, Sir, if the land can be got in a voluntary way there is no need whatever for compulsion. I believe the Bill will pass well without compulsion. The County Council is the best authority for carrying out this Bill. In Hampshire there is already a Sub-Committee of the County Council appointed to undertake the management of allotments, and I believe they have done very well. As farming a good deal of land, I do not think that any man who takes a small holding can immediately make a fortune. There is a difference between small holding allotments; allotments only occupy a man's labour, but directly you cor

small holdings—holdings of anything like 50 acres—the owner has to engage labour, which will run away with a great deal of his profits. Still I hope, Sir, that the experiment of small holdings may be tried, and I certainly hope it may be successful. There is one point upon which I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Agriculture, and that is a question with regard to the 1d. in the £1 of the county rate. I should like to know whether the whole of that money is to go annually in payment for the land? I imagine it cannot be by means of a sinking fund. There is another question, namely, that with regard to tenants purchasing their holding from the landowner. My right hon. Friend did not say what the size of those holdings was to be.

MR. CHAPLIN: From 1 to 50 acres.

MR. JEFFREYS: I am glad to hear that; anything else would be impossible, and I hope that these small holdings, from 1 to 50 acres, may be bought and sold, subject, of course, to the approval of the Board of Agriculture. I wish to congratulate my right hon. Friend in having brought in this Bill, which I hope will be the means of doing something to improve agriculture.

\*MR. HALDANE (Haddington): Upon one point, at all events, Sir, we on this side of the House are agreed. We feel ourselves under an obligation to the right hon. Gentleman for the extraordinary clearness with which he has explained the provisions of this extraordinarily complicated Bill. But the right hon. Gentleman began by saying that it was desirable—this he assumed as a sort of axiom—to establish a system of small proprietors in this country. No doubt that is true; but it is true only, subject to certain limitations. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman realized the feeling of repugnance which some of us have to the creation of any new system of land tenure that would not be subject to public control. To me, it seems that the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman is defective in this respect. The right hon. Gentleman made one admission of great importance. He said the reason why this Bill had been introduced was not so much owing to the general depression in agriculture, but because of the difficulty of keeping

labour on the land—the difficulty of stimulating the labourer to remain on the land unless you gave him some advantage. That is a very substantial admission; it shows that the agricultural labourer is raising his standard of living, and it shows the effect upon him of the extension of the franchise in 1885. There was another most important admission made by the right hon. Gentleman. He told us that inquiry into the reason of the failure of the system of small proprietorships convinced him that it was due to this—that the labourer had been obliged to pay exorbitantly high prices for the land. We know that extraordinary high prices have been paid for what is sometimes called accommodation land—land near a village, or where there was likely to be a special want for cottages or small holdings. People who take advantage of their monopoly to exact large prices are not acting fairly, and, if so, that would seem to necessitate the introduction into a measure of this kind of compulsory powers. The first and most formidable criticism therefore upon this Bill is one which the admission of the right hon. Gentleman, in presenting his case, goes a long way to justify. But there is another point. Under the Allotments Act of 1887 there is at least a partially local machinery. There is nothing of the kind in this Bill. A Committee is to be appointed, not for a particular locality, but for the entire county, and the administration will be in the hands of this Committee, which has no local connection of any sort or kind. Upon the petition of any elector the Committee is to come into action, and the only approach to a local control is to be that of the managers, who have functions analogous to those under the Allotments Act of 1887, which functions would be very limited indeed. It seems to me it would have been better to take another course. We should not have been satisfied with the Board of Guardians—we should not have been satisfied with anything else than Parish Councils—but the right hon. Gentleman might have put some power of initiative into the hands of a known local body, as he did under the Act of 1887, instead of attempting—

MR. CHAPLIN: The hon. Member will perhaps allow me to explain. The object and intention of the Bill in this



respect is this—that the delegation of the smaller class of holdings should be committed to a Committee, which is to consist partly of members of the County Council, of whom the Member for the particular district shall be one, and partly of certain allotment managers selected from the parish in which the land is situated.

MR. HALDANE: I understand there is to be only one Committee for management. The General Committee is under no duty or obligation at all to the locality. There should be a duty on the part of the General Committee to act on the requisition of individuals in the locality, whereas the right hon. Gentleman has put every locality at the absolute mercy of the General Committee, with this exception, that the management of the allotment is put in the hands of the Local Committee, constituted as already explained. That seems to be a formidable point. There is another point. In the Bill which was promoted by my hon. Friend the Member for Bordesley there was a provision of very great public importance. As you were advancing public money for the benefit of a particular class, my hon. Friend in his scheme said that that was not justified unless you got out of the transactions some benefit for the public—let us say for the County Council. Therefore in his Bill my hon. Friend made provision that one quarter of the purchase money should be paid down, and that three-quarters should remain as a perpetual loan, on which 1 per cent. interest was to be paid beyond the rate at which the County Council could borrow from the Treasury. The result of that was a benefit of 1 per cent. to the county in which the land was situated. I think the right hon. Gentleman should have acted upon that principle, and given the county some benefit. As it is running some risk, and as the rates are to be pledged, it is only right and expedient that the county should get some benefit. The County Council would be all the more willing to put the Act in motion if something was to come from it to the county exchequer. There is a further point, Sir, on which I should like to make inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman proposed that the rent charges should in all cases be redeemable. I should like to ask why he did not propose a perpetual rent charge as a *quid pro quo* by way of compensation

Mr. Chaplin

to the county for borrowing this money? If he had taken that course he would have enlisted sympathy in the county. Again, in this Bill there is no power of re-purchase on the part of the County Council, which is to buy and to sell. It might happen that the land was in the neighbourhood of a village or town, and owing to the movement or growth of the population it might acquire greatly enhanced value. If the value of the land become such as was not contemplated at the time of the sale by the local authority to the small holder, surely it is only right that the local authority should have the power to re-purchase on just terms. That was a provision which was made in the Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for Bordesley, and which, I think, ought to have been in the Government Bill. As I said before, we do not desire to see any new system of land tenure that fails to afford adequate protection for the interests of the community. There is another point, my fifth and last. The right hon. Gentleman told us there was to be no power of sub-division or sub-letting. That is so far right; but he did not tell us he had put any restriction on the power of creating limited ownerships in the land dealt with; that there was to be any prohibition, any restriction of the power on the part of the owner of small estates to prevent him creating life estates by will or by deed. As I understand, it will be possible under this Bill for the owner of one of these small properties to create a series of limitations in tail male with remainders over; and I can tell the right hon. Gentleman that in a Bill of this kind there should be some provision restricting the power of settlement. I should also like to ask whether this Bill is to extend to Scotland and to Ireland? Scotland is interested in this question of small holdings, nearly, if not quite, as much as England.

MR. CHAPLIN: I forgot to say that the Bill will extend to Scotland, but not to Ireland.

MR. HALDANE: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman, and I must say that we are very grateful to him for extending his consideration across the Border. We on this side shall look upon this Bill as, in its general outlines, good, in so far as it is the first proposal of any Government to create a system of small holdings in this country—good in

as it is worked out with great care with great knowledge of the conditions of agriculture, and with a view to produce a system of tenure beneficial in the interests of the for whom it is intended. But there are great gaps in it; there are the estates, for example, which I have indicated; and I may say that we are unable to look upon the Bill as more than a first step in the right direction—a step which the right hon. Gentleman should support, and which we should not hinder from taking, but which we should fully consider if necessary in the light of further examination, with a view of bringing the scheme he has proposed more in harmony with the advanced opinions of modern law reformers which will obtain in 20 years that are to be.

(25.) Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Borley, Birmingham): I am only speaking with simple sincerity when I thank the right hon. Gentleman and the Government for the promptness with which they have dealt with this question of small holdings. Even if it is only one first step in the right direction, Government are entitled, and I have no doubt will get, support from all sides of this House in carrying forward their experiments. The right hon. Gentleman has explained in such eloquent terms the advantages of a peasant proprietary, that that head there is nothing more to be said. The deficiency of labour, the migration of labourers to towns, and all the social problems connected therewith, are questions the right hon. Gentleman has dealt so thoroughly, that no further argument is needed to show the necessity of the establishment of a peasant proprietary. The right hon. Gentleman speaks of the displacement of labour from the land. The right hon. Gentleman speaks of the labourers going from the land because of their distaste for the occupation. I venture to say there is no reason whatever why the labourers should leave the occupation to which they are accustomed, and which they like; and if the labourers leave the land is because they are driven from it by the whip of poverty and discomfort. I ask the Government for this earnest consideration of their intentions to deal with this matter, which they have, at any rate, put in a position that will compel future Governments to carry it further. It seems

to me that the Bill goes mainly on the recommendations of the Select Committee. It is in advance of those recommendations on two points. One is the application of the principle to sitting tenants, for which we are thankful to the Government, and the other relates to buildings which the Select Committee could not see their way to recommend. I should like to know if the right hon. Gentleman intends to confine the supply of small holdings by purchase and hire to those resident in the district, because, if I heard the right hon. Gentleman correctly, I gather that is what he intends? If that be so, I trust the right hon. Gentleman will take out that one provision, for the simple reason that if this is to be an instrument in bringing back people from the crowded towns to the land, which is one of the objects of the right hon. Gentleman, he cannot do that unless the Act be put in operation by a suitable Authority. Although I am an upholder of the Parish Council for certain work, it would, I think, be better if the County Council, in very small areas, were the only people they had to look to for putting the Act in operation. The larger and the wealthier area is the better. We have experienced enough of the action of the County Councils, with regard to allotments and other matters, to say that their members not only understand the question, but that they will be willing to carry it into effect. There has been a good deal said about the County Council allotments. The County Councils have shown themselves ready and willing to act in the cases brought before them. With reference to the absence of compulsion, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby gave a very curious reason why the Government should adopt the principle of compulsion. He said they found, after the passing of the Allotment Act of 1887, that compulsion was necessary, and hence the Act of 1890. The right hon. Gentleman himself knows that the Act of 1887 had compulsory powers, and the Act of 1890 had nothing to do with compulsory powers. It was simply an Appeals Bill. Therefore, there is no reason contained in that argument for compulsion. There is a great deal of force in the statement that there is plenty of land in the market. I have said, 20 years ago, that, although an advocate of compulsory powers in

Allotments and Small Holdings Bills, I hold that the compulsory powers once placed there will rarely be used. That is borne out by the working of the Allotments Act. Questions have been asked in the House as to the number of Local Authorities who have adopted the Act in a way which seemed to suggest that none have done so. I know between 100 and 200 who have put the Act in force, by hiring or buying land and letting it to the labourers who required it. I have the names of between 100 and 150 parishes where the Local Authorities have done that. That is sufficient to answer the statement that the Act is a dead letter, a delusion and a snare. Do not let it be supposed that we know nothing of these things here; and probably, now that this information has been given, the justice of making the statements elsewhere may be considered. The reason why I think compulsion is necessary is that it will get rid of a ground of agitation; for bear in mind that, although 100 Local Authorities have put the Act in force, compulsion has not been necessary in more than half-a-dozen cases, and of these half-dozen, only one has been opposed in Parliament. The difficulty in getting allotments is not so much due to the landlords as to the large farmers. One could not expect in these times a landlord to cut off a piece of a farm; but if he were compelled, the responsibility would be gone from him. It was the farmers who complained when land was wanted that the piece selected was the very best land on the farm. I want the right hon. Gentleman to be sure—for I am not lawyer enough to know—how will it be in the case of land in the hands of trustees? Have they the power voluntarily to sell if they wish? And, above all, how about land in the power of Corporations, such, for instance, as the college lands? I am in hopes that the right hon. Gentleman will make some modifications before we see the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that one-fourth would have to be paid down. I think a sum which would ensure the *bona fides* of the purchaser would be sufficient. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners find 15 per cent. enough; Lord Wantage's Land Company take 10 or 20 per cent. Perhaps the figures of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would be a happy medium. There is one

*Mr. Jesse Collings*

very strong argument I wish to add on the lines of the hon. Member for Haddington (Mr. Haldane). The Bill adopts the perpetual rent system; but gives power to redeem it. It need not be in the Bill at all if there is any power to redeem it. I want the right hon. Gentleman to consider when we are entering on a new system which has not been tried, and which he and others have seen has failed so miserably on the Continent. It is quite true it has been a miserable failure in some parts of the Continent, but happily we know the exact causes of that. In adopting the plan for Great Britain, however, we are bound to take safeguards against every cause which has created failure abroad. These causes are the curse of the money-lender, sub-division, and sub-letting. These are the three evils in France. I am not urging a system which will commend itself on the platform where men will get something for nothing. I want a system that will thrive and blossom. It will take some time to create a village proprietary. But let the right hon. Gentleman amend those drawbacks which he knows have caused failure. I remember when the Education Bill of 1879 was passed. I said to an American "We are far behind you in education." "Yes," he said, "but there is this peculiar thing in England, there are a long time in adopting a reform. They are slow to move; but when once they do move, they do so on improved principles, and go ahead quickly." It is the duty of the right hon. Gentleman who he is about to try a new experiment—the greatness of which no words can over-estimate—to avoid those evils, which are as plain as a pikestaff. As to the question of quit-rent, let it be two-fifths of what you like, but keep it. If you allow it to be redeemed, or do not confine it to the cultivating class, these rent-charges will be bought up, and the land will be sold at exorbitant rents. There is one case where there are 90 small holdings at 60 occupiers in a population of 30. That originally had a rent-charge of £9 10s. What do you find there? Those who had the rent-charge and stuck to it are doing well; but a number of the rent-charges have been bought by small shopkeepers, and there are cases where the £9 10s. rent-charge has become £1. The man who has bought the rent-charge is a small landlord, and he is charging

and 60 per cent., and in some cases double the price he paid. I would implore the right hon. Gentleman to guard against this. Everyone knows that the small impecunious landlord is the worst. The necessities of his position oblige him to get every farthing he can. Suppose, as I am sure will be the case in some years, that some of these holdings will be in the market. If they are confined to cultivators and not allowed to be sub-let, the small capitalist, as soon as he knows this, would go out of the room and cease to be a bidder, leaving it to the cultivators. Call these holdings Chaplin holdings or anything you like, but confine them to the cultivators. I would also urge on the right hon. Gentleman the desirability of allowing the Local Authority to advance money for putting up buildings. A man can put up the buildings sometimes at half the price of the Local Authority. There were some cases of this kind in connection with Lord Wantage's scheme. If the right hon. Gentleman does not extend the power of advancing money to the holders he will not meet the requirements of the poorer class of cultivators. Of course, this will have to be done under proper safeguards, but the greatest of all the improvements in the Bill is to make the quit-rent of an unredeemable character, and that Local Authorities should be allowed to charge somewhat more for the loan than they pay to the Exchequer. This would bring all the inhabitants of a district in favour of the scheme, as they would come within the range of the benefit that such a scheme will confer. I believe this is only one portion of the work of the reform of rural life. If the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman will allow this small extra allowance I have referred to, the localities would have an income for sanitation and other things without doing anyone any harm.

\*(6.50.) Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): There is a great deal in the friendly criticism of my hon. Friend opposite with which I am disposed to agree. I need hardly say, however, that I have no sympathy whatever with the preference he expressed, and which was also expressed by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) in favour of the compulsory acquisition of land. That I look upon as a most perilous step, especially in connection with a measure which is of a

tentative character. What my hon. Friend said of the necessity of taking full cognisance of the causes which have led to the failure of the system of small holdings is, I think, a matter well deserving the attention of the House. The hon. Member for the Bordesley Division referred to the failure in parts of the Continent. He should have carried his observations a step nearer home, and referred to the system of small holdings in England, and also urged the House to take cognisance of the causes of the failure in England. I think it is generally admitted that the system hitherto tried in England has been decidedly a failure. In the Counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland the system has been largely tried. The system was in the hands of those who were to the manner born—those who in most cases possessed ample capital, energy, and experience, which enabled them to give the system full and ample trial. The system, I much regret to say, has broken down in these cases. The main cause of failure was that the owners found they could invest their capital better in stock than in land. In parts of Lincolnshire, to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, a very different state of affairs prevailed. The value of land for selling purposes rose very high. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Haldane) entirely misrepresented what fell from my right hon. Friend. I understood him to refer to the fact that the competition for freehold ownership had been so keen that many owners had purchased their land at fabulous prices. I did not understand him to say that the price charged to the hirer of land had been unduly raised. What are the causes which have told against small, as well as large, holders? The hon. Member referred to the curse of the money-lender. I hope my right hon. Friend will insert a provision that the consent of some competent authority shall be necessary before any charge can be imposed upon land. The hon. Gentleman also referred to the case of sub-letting. Against that, also, I hope ample precautions will be taken. He also referred to the question of sub-division. I trust my right hon. Friend will take effectual safeguards against that. But my hon. Friend omitted to notice the main cause of the failure in small as well as large holdings—namely, foreign competition;

and added to that is the ever-increasing burden of rates and taxes, which, combined with foreign competition, have contributed towards forcing the small holders to realise what remained of their property, and the practical extinction of what was undoubtedly most valuable, the institution of small holders of land in this country. I hope the House will bear these matters in mind, and there is another which I think ought to be urged very seriously. One of the main causes which has prevented land from passing from hand to hand in large, and especially in small, quantities, has been the excessive cost of transfer. The present Government introduced, a few Sessions ago, a measure dealing with the subject, but, for some inconceivable reason, they handicapped its most useful provisions, tending in that direction, by utterly uncalled for and most mischievous provisions, dealing with the wholly incongruous subject of primogeniture, and thereby brought about the rejection of the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite spoke of imposing the most extraordinary conditions for preventing the land acquired under this Bill from being made the subject of any kind of settlement. But what would he do where the owners of the land died? I suppose it would be subject to primogeniture of the most rigid form.

MR. HALDANE: The land would be sold if the son could not carry it on.

\*MR. LOWTHER: Of course, if the hon. and learned Gentleman is going to sell it absolutely, that removes to some extent the difficulty with which he surrounded his argument. I hope my right hon. Friend will, in Committee, note the suggestions which have been made for preventing grave abuses that would otherwise arise under this scheme, and that we shall have a measure which will, at any rate, give a chance of this system being fairly tried. I would, however, warn the House against anticipating any large results from any measure of this kind. In my own opinion, nothing in the shape of legislative action will induce persons to embark in the speculation of the ownership and cultivation of land, unless the conditions under which agriculture is conducted are made such that a man of average capacity and reasonable industry can make a living out of it. So long as they are ground down by rates and overwhelmed by foreign competition, very

few practical men will be induced to embark in a business which has to be carried on under such hopeless conditions.

\*(7.5.) MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E. Rugby): I rise mainly for the purpose of putting a couple of questions to the right hon. Gentleman the Minister of Agriculture. I have always thought it unwise to enter into any lengthened criticism on the First Reading of a Bill, and although the right hon. Gentleman introduced this measure with very great clearness, when we have it printed, I have no doubt we shall find we have misunderstood it on some important points. He referred to the class of yeomen, and it seems to me that this is essentially a yeomen's Bill—a Bill to enable men in a comparatively good position in life to get land—and I do not believe it will be the least good to one in a thousand of the agricultural labourers. They do not want what, in this Bill, are called small holdings, at all; but what the bulk of the English labourers want is a thoroughly popular system of allotments in extension of the present system. It seems to me that there are two great blots in this Bill. The first is, that there is no compulsory power in it given to the Local Authority to purchase; and, what is still more important, that there is no compulsory power of leasing. The other blot is, that the authority which is to administer the Act, the County Council, represents too large an area. One of the main difficulties in administering the Allotments Act has arisen from the fact that the rural sanitary authority, the Board of Guardians, is composed of men coming from different parishes, so that it is impossible for them to know the circumstances of each parish. How much, then, will that difficulty be aggravated in the area of a whole county. We shall have an opportunity of discussing these matters at a later stage, and I will not go into them now, but will put these two questions to the right hon. Gentleman. Am I right in understanding that the restriction upon the building of a house upon a small holding applies, even if the tenant or owner is prepared to build that house at his own expense; and, secondly, I want to ask whether the 1d. in the £1, which will come out of the County Rate, will be borne by the whole county, or by the parish or parishes where small holdings are provided?

Mr. James Lowther

(7.10.) MR. CHARLES W. GRAY (Essex, Maldon): I think the measure which the right hon. Gentleman has introduced has shown that, at any rate, if we are approaching dissolution, we have got a kick or two left in us. The Bill is one which may reach a very long way indeed; but I should be the last to throw any obstruction in the way of a proposal of this sort. On the contrary, I rise to give it cordial support. It is sometimes said that the farmers do not want such a Bill, because it would set up a number of men to compete with them in their own industry; but I have never heard any objection coming from the farmers on that score, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman opposite, representing the great industries of the Midland and Northern Counties, will remember that fact. The hon. Member for Haddington (Mr. Haldane) criticised the Bill at considerable length; but his criticisms were very much those which a lawyer would probably pass upon any measure proposed from the other side of the House; and there was nothing in his remarks, or in any others we have heard, to show that there should be any hesitation in reading the Bill a first time, or that it should not have fair-play. I hope it will not only get fair-play, but that when it becomes an Act it will carry with it all the benefits which the hon. Member for the Bordesley Division (Mr. J. Collings) thinks will follow legislation of this kind. With reference to the explanation so lucidly made by the Minister of Agriculture, I want him to give us an idea as to how selections would be made in those cases where there are more applicants than small holdings. If this selection is to be made in accordance with common sense, I should think that if there were an applicant from the town, and also one from the country, you had better select the man who knows something about farming. The objections of any considerable degree of weight raised by the other side have been limited to two—namely, that this Bill is not compulsory, and that the authority to deal with this matter is the County Council. I understood that authority was only proposed because there is at present no better authority to undertake the responsibility. But there is nothing to lead me to suppose that, if District Councils are set up, they may not have either the entire, or some proportion of

the authority on this subject. The present Government is more or less pledged to go on with the question of District Councils if they remain in power a sufficiently long time; and if the other side come in, of course we know, from the speeches delivered in the country, that in anticipation of Home Rule or any other question, one of the first measures it will bring forward will be one for establishing District Councils. The other point of criticism had reference to compulsion, but I think we should be very careful before making tentative measures of this sort compulsory. If it succeed, I suppose that later it would be quite in the power of our Party, or of the opposite Party if they should come into Office, to make the scheme compulsory. If we made it compulsory now, without more experience, we might do more harm than good, and cases might arise where small holdings were applied for, simply to prevent certain industries being set up in the locality. I hope those who wish the measure to be compulsory will have a little patience, and I hope it will be understood that the agriculturalists as a class have no objection at all to a measure of this sort being fairly tried.

\*(7.25.) MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire): I desire to add my congratulations to those which have already been offered to the right hon. Gentleman. I had the pleasure of sitting with him on a Committee which inquired into this question, and I am extremely glad that he has found so early an opportunity of bringing its decisions before the House. Personally, I think it is by far the most important measure introduced by the Government since the President of the Local Government Board brought forward the Local Government Bill for England and Wales. It gives real value to the establishment of County Councils; for the value of the Local Government Bill lay, not so much in its powers, as in its possibilities, and this Bill is far more valuable in its possibilities than in its powers; and it would be so, especially in two points which were omitted, but were embodied in the Bill of the hon. Member for the Bordesley Division. They were compulsory power to purchase, and the principle of the final municipal control of all land on which operations may be carried out under the Small Holdings Bill. The principle of com-

pulsory purchase may very well take care of itself in future Parliaments. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will accept an Amendment in favour of that most valuable principle of municipal control. I should like to call attention to one or two other omissions, which in some parts of the country will largely delay, if they do not frustrate, the operations of the Bill. I refer, first, to that large class of small holdings which exist in certain parts of the country, and notably in Wales and parts of Yorkshire, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, to which are attached large mountain pastures. No cause has tended so much to diminish the class of yeomen as the vast enclosure of commons which took place from the middle of the last century to within 20 years ago. It came out distinctly in the evidence before the Committee that in Wales the small farmers in the hilly and mountainous districts were able to live a comparatively thriving life because they had, attached to their holdings, common pasturage on the hill and mountain sides, the value of which I need not point out. If the right hon. Gentleman desire to enfranchise, so to speak, the present small holders in the hilly districts, and to create a larger number, he will have to look into the question of the regulation of these pasturages. In some cases smaller holdings had been consolidated, and the mountain pasturage belonging to each of the small holdings was also consolidated, so as to belong to the larger farm. Besides that, according to a witness before the Richmond Commission, the small farmers are only allowed to pasture two sheep to the acre of their holdings, while the larger farmers are able to pasture three. The right hon. Gentleman, therefore, if he desire to increase the number of small holdings, will have to make some provision for the new division of these pasturages attaching to farms. The right hon. Gentleman did not conceal from the House the enormous risks which all concerned in these transactions will take on themselves. There is the comparative inexperience of those who will obtain the new holdings; the question of having instalments paid regularly to the Local Authority so that the repayments to the Loan Commissioners may be properly made; then the further question, that the small holder may not be able to put up buildings;

*Mr. T. E. Ellis*

and the ever-existing fear of bad seasons, the cattle plague, and other evils affecting the farming community. Under these circumstances, it is of importance that we examine closely the amount of the purchase money which the County Council may pay for the land. The amount of the purchase money is the keystone of the Bill. Is the County Council to enter as an ordinary bidder into a public auction room to buy the land; for I know that in Wales certain forms and ingenious dodges well-known to auctioneers produce brisk competition, so as to secure fancy prices for the land. Many persons buy land not because they want to cultivate it, but because they desire to have a county position or to be made County Magistrates. If the duty of bringing back the labourers on the land is to be thrown on the County Council, will the right hon. Gentleman give them a right of pre-emption to the land? Further, what are his real guarantees that only a fair and reasonable price will be given for the land? If such a guarantee be not given, it seems to me that the Bill will land not merely the County Council, but the Loan Commissioners, in considerable difficulty. I think this is the crucial point in the working of the Bill. Can he give us further light on the rules under which the land, having been bought by the County Council, is to be sold to the applicants? Is it to be by public auction? If the County Council is to buy by auction and then to sell to the applicants by auction, the cultivator will be sorely over-burdened, and the Bill will topple about the heads of those who will try to work it. I should further like to say that, although this Bill will in its present form do a great deal to re-create a class that is of the utmost value to the community, it is only the first step, and many more steps will have to be taken, and will be logically and inevitably taken, by future Parliaments. I think the principle of compulsory purchase will have to be applied. I know large districts in Wales where the tenants would give anything to purchase their holdings at a fair and reasonable price, but the landlords are unwilling to sell. It is futile for the right hon. Gentleman to say that there is plenty of land in the market. There may be in Essex and some other parts of England, but in

Wales there is little land in the market, and it is only very rarely that the present holders have any chance of getting it at a reasonable price. One of the first effects of the Bill will be, I believe, to raise a cry—on the whole, a reasonable one—that no private sale of land whatever shall take place without the sanction of a Public Authority. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not only take every step to pass the present Bill, but will accept occasional Amendments from this side, and more especially do I hope that he will give considerable attention to the clauses of the Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for Bordesley, with a view to giving County Councils and the Local Authorities a real and permanent hold on the land.

(7.40.) MR. MARK J. STEWART (Kirkcudbright): I am one of those who feel the importance of this Bill as much as any Member of the House, but I do not think it is going to do so much good to the agricultural labourers as the right hon. Gentleman and some of his friends think it will. The speech we have just listened to will no doubt receive the deep attention of the House when the details of the Bill come to be discussed, but I hope my right hon. Friend will give the possessors of land a chance to do what they like with their own, and to get a reasonable and fair price for it. I am convinced that in the great majority of cases landlords would be only too glad to get a fair remunerative price to sell part of their land. In Scotland there are large tracts of land which few agriculturists would care to have much to do with, and others which might be made more fertile if the state of the farming industry permitted any degree of certainty of payment. The opposition to this measure appears to me to rest mainly on the non-compulsory clauses. I hope and trust the right hon. Gentleman will stand firm on this point. There is no reason why a fair measure should not be submitted to the country without compulsion, and have a fair amount of success. If you adopt compulsion in the first instance, you alienate a large number of persons who are in favour of giving the labourers a larger right and interest in the land than they now possess. But the right hon. Gentleman must not run away with the idea that by increasing the number of small holdings he will confer a great benefit on

the whole community. While I hail with delight a larger number of small holdings in the country, I have had considerable experience of the nature and duties of working them. On those estates in which it is my lot to take a very deep interest it is not only the very small farmers that have at this time a great difficulty in meeting their rents, but the larger farmers, with the best machinery, driven by electricity, water, and steam, have difficulty in making both ends meet. Take away these advantages, and the small farmer is in many cases no better off in point of pecuniary emolument than the labourer. I have always taken the view that it is essential on the part of all large proprietors to have a certain number of stepping-stones into their larger farms, whereby the labourer may raise himself by going from one to another, and so become in time a large tenant farmer. It is the absence of these small holdings which I so deeply deplore. There is no doubt, however, that recent legislation and practice in the farming world has tended to the taking up of these small holdings and making them into larger farms. The Bill will not meet with any opposition from the landlords, who are glad to get their rent, whether from a large or small holder. They are more sure of it from the small farmer who works hard with his own hands, and has not to pay wages to any large extent. Fault has been found with the County Council, but where you have a body representing a large area you may depend that you will have greater fairness and impartiality than in the smaller Parish Councils, where there is always a certain amount of jealousy and rivalry which it is difficult to get rid of, but that is met by associating the representatives of a larger area in the County Council. It is said that the County Council is too large for dealing with such a question, but, of course, it would appoint Committees to deal with certain portions of the district, and the members of those Committees would not necessarily be connected with the district in which they had to deal. I would ask my right hon. Friend if there are to be two Bills on this question—one for England and one for Scotland? The interests of Scotland are likely to be somewhat lost sight of in considering the larger area of England. There is an apparent



disposition in the House to pass the Bill. Let us hope it will be a useful measure, and may assist the labourers and those of the agricultural community who are anxious to push on and rise; and with this view I shall have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, though I fear the House may possibly find its results are not quite so favourable as they seem disposed to think.

\*(7.50.) MR. HENEAGE (Great Grimby): I must congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on his speech and the practical discussion which has followed it. I do not agree with the right hon. Member for Thanet that the small holders of the Isle of Axholme were brought to grief by the price of corn. They bought their holdings at a high price, and borrowed three-fourths of the purchase money from the solicitors from whom they bought the lands, and when they could not pay the interest the solicitors foreclosed, and most of them got neither capital nor interest. With regard to the question of compulsion, I, for one, am very glad it has not been adopted, and I think all the argument of the right hon. Member for Derby is worthless, for he was entirely wrong when he alluded to the Allotments Acts. The first Bill had compulsion in it; the second was purely an Appeal Bill. So I do not think the right hon. Gentleman need pay much regard to the precedents before him. What I wish to press on my right hon. Friend is this: I think the remarks in regard to the financial clauses have been exceedingly just, and are, I think, well worthy of attention. I am strongly in favour of there being a quit-rent on the land, and that precautions should be taken to prevent the land being saddled with a mortgage in the same way as in the case of the Isle of Axholme. The clause at present stands that a fourth is to be paid at once, a fourth as rent-charge, and half is to be paid off by terminable annuities. I would suggest that the first fourth be paid at once, the second fourth by terminable annuities, and that the other half should remain as a quit-rent for ever. Nobody would ever be inclined to lend money on land so encumbered. I agree, also, that the ratepayers should have some benefit out of the transactions. There will be no difficulty in getting money at  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent., and if the Local Authority charged  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or  $3\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. it would leave a

*Mr. Mark J. Stewart*

margin for the benefit of the ratepayers. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he cannot consider with the Law Officers of the Crown some clause which would keep down conveyancing expenses. I regret that the Bill brought in by the present Government three years ago was not passed in its entirety; but as it was not, I think something should be put in the Bill to prevent the running up of law costs with regard to these small holdings. As to buildings, the right hon. Gentleman is perfectly right in not allowing the County Council to bear the cost, as you would have no security for them, and they will be put up by the tenant if he is the sort of man to have the holding. I believe the Bill will be a great benefit, and I cannot see why it should not be further improved in Committee if the right hon. Gentleman will only consider some of the suggestions that have been made.

(7.55.) MR. W. C. QUILTER (Suffolk, Sudbury): I cannot allow this Bill to pass without a few words from me, as I take so much interest in the subject. I want to express, very shortly, the objections I hold to some of the proposals of my right hon. Friend. I think he will find it necessary to introduce compulsory powers, for, without them in the background, he will not be able to make arrangements with the landowners. I heartily approve of the County Council as a body to whom these questions must be remitted. In my own county the most interesting question has been the housing of the working classes, and the difficulty we had to meet was the smallness of the area dealt with by the Board of Guardians. It is now found that the County Council is the only body able to deal with questions of this kind on a scale of sufficient magnitude. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will consider whether the limit of £25 may not be reduced. I believe that this Bill will be of considerable benefit to the labouring classes, although I cannot join with my hon. Friend the Member for Bordesley in the sanguine anticipations in which he indulged. I believe that until the Land Laws of this country are radically altered all legislation of this kind will, to a certain extent, be in vain, and I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will pay some heed to the remarks of my right hon. Friend

who has just spoken below me, as to the possibility of the law's delays and lawyers' charges being serious hindrances to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill that is now being introduced.

(8.35.) MR. JOSHUA ROWNTREE (Scarborough): As I understand, from the right hon. Gentleman's very clear and able statement, there is to be only one authority under this Bill, the authority of the County Council, and that the County Council will have absolute authority, so far as they think fit, over the whole county area, including, of course, county boroughs. But if that be correct, it means that the non-county boroughs of whatever size, whether Quarter Sessions boroughs or not, or having any general financial relation to the county or not, are really to be treated as non-existent. I may be quite mistaken in this matter, but supposing it is so, however much the boroughs may welcome this Bill on other grounds, I very much fear they would feel bound to protest against this part of it. It would be unjust that boroughs with heavy rates for special purposes of their own should be liable to rates from which, in the great majority of cases, they would derive no benefit. And, further, in many cases, as the right hon. Gentleman is no doubt fully aware, where boroughs include in their financial area a large amount of land, and are in some cases large landowners themselves—as in the case of the borough which I have the honour to represent, which owns 500 acres or more of its own—it then would be felt a considerable hardship that another authority should invade the area of the borough, with powers to rate the burgesses, to buy and sell land, to let land and build houses, and fix their own sanitary conditions, all within the area of that municipal borough. I hope that is not proposed by the Bill. If it is proposed I am sure it will be a very strong objection to that part of the Bill.

(8.39.) MR. ROUND (Essex, N.E., Harwich): There are one or two boroughs in the county which I have the honour to represent, having a considerable acreage of land, and they, no doubt, as the hon. Member opposite has pointed out, will look with jealousy on the powers of other authorities to deal with that land. An hon. Gentleman opposite said a short time ago that he

wished the time would come when no private property in this country should be sold without the intervention or sanction of some public authority. I think that such a state of things would be very detrimental to private individuals and to the community generally. I rose to offer my thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for bringing in this measure to-night. I think the measure has fallen into good hands. He has always taken a great interest in all matters connected with the agricultural interest in this country, and was instrumental in bringing about the appointment of the Royal Commission for inquiring into the cause of the depression in Agriculture, many of whose recommendations, which I think were most useful, have been carried into effect. There is no one who is familiar with the history of our country districts in former times but must regret the disappearance of the small holders and old yeomen from the soil, who were a most industrious and useful class, and who have been squeezed out, as it were, by force of circumstances. I trust this effort of the right hon. Gentleman will meet with success. I look upon it as an experiment in the right direction, though I am afraid that if the price of wheat remain as it is now, or as it was last year, 30s. or 32s. a quarter—I am afraid there cannot be much profit made out of the land unless these prices alter. I agree with what an hon. Member said from these Benches a short time ago—that this Bill offers a stepping-stone to the labourers to rise and better themselves. In our wheat-growing districts I do not think the land can be better cultivated than it is now, when it is in the hands of large farmers who understand their business; but no opportunity then arises for labourers to better themselves, and I much prefer to see holdings of different sizes in our rural parishes. This is not the time to discuss the details of this Bill, but I trust the right hon. Gentleman will be able to pass it through this House this Session; and I shall conclude by asking him when the Bill will be printed and laid on the Table of the House?

(8.43.) MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): I rise with considerable satisfaction to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman and Her Majesty's Government for having, as we might say in Scotland, at the long length, recognised that there is

such a thing as a land question in Scotland. We who have of late been sitting in this House for three or four years, and hearing the allotments question discussed as applied to England, we did not observe, when we had a Local Government Bill for Scotland passed, a recognition of the fact that there was a land question in Scotland. Her Majesty's Government introduced certain clauses into that Bill, but told the Scottish Members that unless they accepted them *en bloc*, and as proposed by Her Majesty's Government, no time could be given for discussing the question. On several occasions I reminded the First Lord of the Treasury and the President of the Local Government Board of the promises that they made, that this question would be looked into and remedied at an early date by Her Majesty's Government. But it has been the privilege of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture for the first time to recognise Scotland in dealing with this question of the allotments and small holdings, and I can assure him that this recognition of Scotland, as comprehended in this Bill, will be looked upon with gratitude on the part of the agriculturists of Scotland. I had a matter suggested to me by my hon. Friend the Member for Scarborough in regard to the question of rating. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture may recollect that on the passing of the Local Government (Scotland) Bill the rating question was dealt with in a somewhat exceptional manner; the county rate being stereotyped upon the average of a certain number of years. That is to say, a certain number of years of the average rate was taken, and that became the stereotyped rate for the county assessment. Now, what I would wish the right hon. Gentleman to recognise is, that any rate but the stereotyped rate—it was arranged by a clause in the Bill—that any rate beyond the stereotyped rate in after years would be divided between the occupier and the proprietor. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in the case of this penny, it will then be a penny on the occupiers and a penny on the proprietors; or whether it will be a penny divided according to the arrangement of that Bill, between occupiers and proprietors? I hope the right hon. Gentleman follows

*Mr. Esslemont*

my statement of the case, and that he will give his attention to the matter before the Bill is drafted. There are only two other points which I wish to bring under the right hon. Gentleman's attention. Speaking, as I have the honour to do, for one of the most agricultural counties in Scotland, I hope the right hon. Gentleman may excuse me in saying that in treating Scotland it must be with regard to Scottish rights and interests, and with considerations which differ in some respects from this Bill as applied to the English counties. There is one consideration I think I ought to press very strongly upon the Government, and that is, that so far as we in Scotland are concerned, we, I think, almost universally recognise that no Bill dealing with either allotments or small holdings will be of any great consequence to Scotland, or will be cared for very much one way or the other in Scotland, unless it is followed up by compulsory powers. I quite recognise what the hon. Member for the Bordesley Division said—that if we had compulsory powers in the Bill the compulsory powers might be very seldom put into execution; but it was the compulsory powers that enabled occupiers and proprietors to come to terms themselves. Therefore, I would strongly impress upon the right hon. Gentleman that he should consider now what has been pointed out to him. And I submit to him that this Bill will be ineffectual unless it contain within its four corners a compulsory power which is to effect the purposes intended. The right hon. Gentleman has said that no help or encouragement would be given to a man who built a house upon a holding which was of less value than £25.

MR. CHAPLIN: The provision in the Bill is that no dwelling-house is to be erected on a holding which is of less value than £25, unless the Local Authority have reason to think that the particular holding is sufficient to maintain the man and his family by the cultivation of the holding, and in that case he may be allowed to erect a dwelling-house.

\*MR. ESSELMONT: I understand the principle, and it is because I understand it so well that I doubt the wisdom of the provision. The right hon. Gentleman says that that class of individuals he wants to maintain in the country—he

does not want so much that a man should be kept in the country who has as much land as he can cultivate and keep himself and his family as he does to keep in the country thousands of men who have not, and can never have, as much land; but who, on account of the circumstances of their position, have to make their living by working for others. If that individual, by his frugality and industry, got into the position that he could get into possession of five acres of land on which to make a permanent home for his wife and his children, and hiring out his labour to the neighbouring farmers, why should a disability be put upon this service man, that he should not be allowed to erect his little house upon these five acres of land? Why should I be told, because I am placed in circumstances in which I cannot stock or purchase 25 acres of land, that my wife and family are never to have a home? Why, these are the disadvantages that send the hire classes into the city. The right hon. Gentleman knows Scotland, and he cannot be ignorant of the fact that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction there, from the circumstances that, in order to get those homes, the people have to congregate in the villages in the country. What we want is to give a comprehensive scheme, to give the allotments and small holdings in the district where the labourer exists. The right hon. Gentleman says, "You shall not have a home there." He excludes the labourer under a value of £25. I hope, under these circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman will reconsider this, because, if I understand these conditions, I may at all events press this point upon him, that no harm could result to anybody by the industrial labourer building his house on any number of acres, or even on half an acre, if he can do it. I hope before the Government comes to any settled conclusion on this subject they will give this matter some more consideration, and I assure the right hon. Gentleman that it is one of very great importance, and one of very great interest to the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Unlike the right hon. Member for the Bordesley Division, who says he wishes that the Bill may fructify and grow, I am a practical politician, and therefore I wish that something will accrue the very year after the Act of Parliament is passed. We have been waiting to see some

justice done to Ireland, and though very little has been done, something has been done with regard to the agricultural question. But nothing has been done for Scotland. We waited to see England get an Allotments Bill, and afterwards a compulsory Allotments Bill. If you want to preserve the unity of the Empire, and if you do not want to hasten Home Rule, I ask you to mete out equal justice to all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions.

\* (9.5.) MR. BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I desire with very great sincerity to associate myself with the congratulations that have been bestowed upon the right hon. Gentleman for having formulated this very businesslike and comprehensive scheme. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of restoring the old yeoman to his place upon the soil. But the "old yeoman" is a thing of the past, and I much fear we shall never see him again. He disappeared chiefly through his improvidence. He was not at all a thrifty person, though his social habits did obtain for him a certain amount of popularity, but as this measure is to bring about a social rather than an economic change, I hope it will not restore that unthrifty personage. Although in regard to general agricultural sentiments I quite agree with the Minister for Agriculture, I entirely agree with the Member for the Bordesley Division that it will be a mistake, however desirable the sentiment may be, to place these small holders in the position of absolute freeholders, and so enable them, as in the case of the "old yeoman," to have recourse to the nearest solicitor to mortgage their land to him. With regard to what has fallen from my hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcudbright, I think, Sir, notwithstanding the fact that farming on a large scale will not pay, that fruit culture and similar agricultural industries will, especially if the small holding is in any way near a large town. If there is no market near, you had better abandon the idea that Parliament can make farming of any sort pay. Great stress has been laid upon the word "compulsion," which is a favourite word with the friends of liberty in this House. They seem unable to understand how it can be possible to make anyone happy, except at the expense of somebody else. I hope,

however, that what has been said in the course of this Debate will strengthen the feeling of the House not to have compulsion if they can avoid it. There is one point which I did not catch in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. I understood him to say that the Local Authority might provide buildings for which the small holder is to pay—I hope on easy terms. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the Bill he has introduced, and I hope it will be pressed forward and become law without undue delay.

\*(9.9.) MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith, &c.): In the lucid speech of the right hon. Gentleman there was only one omission, and that was in relation to the question as to whether this measure is or is not to extend North of the Tweed. I learned afterwards it was to extend to Scotland, and there is a special point on which the extension should be supported. Scotland, as the right hon. Gentleman knows, is divided into two portions, which are cultivated on very different systems. The Northern part and the Western part are already under legislation different from that known in any other part of Great Britain, and some provisions have already been made with regard to the extension of holdings there which involve the application of a system of compulsory leasing. There are very stringent provisions in the Crofters' Act, and there is a considerable demand for an extension of holdings. If the right hon. Gentleman introduces too many limitations in his Bill its results will not be so large as are expected or required. In the Highland area the rent received from the soil is exceedingly small, and does not, in many cases, represent the outlay on the buildings and improvements. Proprietors can hardly undertake the creation of small holdings, the burden is so great. The only way it can be done is either through some national authority, or some local authority, such as that to which the right hon. Gentleman gives scope for work under his Bill. Until the local authority is allowed to embark on the creation of a peasant proprietary on a considerable scale, very little will be done to meet the land question, which has assumed great proportions in the Highlands. There is great difficulty in fixing the area to which agrarian legislation should

*Mr. Brookfield*

apply. I think the land question in the Highlands should be dealt with by the County Councils or local authorities, provided you make the powers of these local bodies sufficiently comprehensive. The hon. Member for Aberdeen mentioned a point as to the size of the holdings on which houses may be erected. The right hon. Gentleman knows that there are comparatively few holdings of £25 in the Highlands, and unless there is to be a prohibition of extending the Crofter areas, this £25 limit of annual value will have to be altered, for otherwise the Bill will be inoperative, in so far as the poorer parts of Scotland are concerned.

\*(9.15.) COLONEL EDWIN HUGHES (Woolwich): I desire to ask a question and to make a suggestion. First, I would ask why the Allotments Acts do not apply to London? There are a number of parishes on the edge of the County of London. There is Eltham with 3,000 acres, and Plumstead with 3,000 acres, only 500 acres of which are covered with buildings. In all these cases, those who want allotments can only get them at a very high price indeed. I do not see why the County of London should be excluded from the provisions of the Acts. There are many labouring men at Eltham and Plumstead who would be glad of the opportunity of getting allotments to occupy themselves with during their spare hours. Another anomaly is, that by the Public Health Act of 1891 Woolwich was placed under the Public Health Act of 1875, and has now become an Urban Sanitary Authority. Consequently, Woolwich will be the only parish in the Metropolis under present circumstances for which it will be necessary to appoint a Committee to act under the Allotments Acts. If this condition of things remains unaltered jealousy will be excited among the people on both sides of Woolwich which will have special advantages that were surely not intended by the framers of the Allotments Acts. Taking London as a whole, I admit there is not much scope for agricultural farms or allotments, but so far as there is scope I do not see any reason why these people should not have the advantages of the Allotments Acts and of this Bill, seeing that they are responsible as taxpayers for the working of the scheme. I hope the

right hon. Gentleman will see that there is no ground for jealousy as between one Metropolitan parish and another, and that he will make all the Metropolitan areas alike.

(9.18.) MR. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): Although the right hon. Gentleman in introducing the Bill made an extremely lucid speech, there are one or two points that are still somewhat obscure. In the first place, as regards the financial aspect of the question, it is not evident from what source the money is to come which is to be used by the County Council for putting up buildings—whether it is to come out of the pockets of those who are set up as cultivators, or out of the money the Council will be able to borrow. The second point is whether the interest of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to be paid by the County Council to the Government is not only to include the payment of interest, but is also to act as a sinking fund, and to include the gradual re-payment of the capital sum. These are two points I hope the right hon. Gentleman will make clear. It seems to me that the criticisms of this measure will crystallize round four principal points. The first point is the absence of the recognition of the principle of compulsion which might be brought to bear on those unwilling to sell their land. There are cases, especially in regard to settled estates, where the principle of compulsion will be absolutely essential to the successful working of this Act. The second point is that of the area. The County Council is too large for the purpose of settling the holdings under this Act, and if it is possible to secure a Local Committee of the County Council and the allotment managers under the Allotments Act, surely it might be possible to arrange for a Committee, consisting partly of members of the County Council and partly of representatives of the different parishes, who might take steps under this scheme for the management and for the provision of small holdings. The third point is the principle of compulsory leasing, which I do not think is open to the objections stated against it by the right hon. Gentleman. The principle is by no means novel. It was introduced in the Scotch Crofters' Act of 1886 by the Member for Bridgeton, it finds a place in the Irish Labourers' Act, and it is difficult to see why it should not have application to England, seeing

it would facilitate the action of the county in letting land to applicants. The fourth point is that of price. It is not clear whether there is in the Bill any provision that the land purchased by the County Council for the purpose of small holdings is to be purchased at a fair price. Not only is it desirable that there should be provision as to fair price, but it should be stated on what principle the words "fair price" were used—in short, what constituted a fair price. My hon. Friends the Members for Haddington and Bordesley have raised the question of the perpetual municipal control of these holdings. I have no essential objection to municipal control, nor do I object to the levying of a small quit rent in perpetuity as a sign and symbol of that control. At the same time, if any scheme of this kind is to succeed, it is most desirable that those who buy should have the best means of turning their capital, their energy, and their industry to the best possible account, and they will only be able to do that if they can do what they like with their own, and if they are not liable to arbitrary interference on the part of any body or individual. With this reservation, I agree with the observations of my hon. Friends the Members for Haddington and Bordesley with respect to this point.

MR. CHAPLIN: I have to thank hon. Gentlemen for the manner in which they have received this Bill. I have no reason to be dissatisfied; on the contrary, I have every reason to be pleased with the mode in which it has been accepted, subject to certain reservations made by Members sitting on both sides. As regards the question of compulsion, I do not think I need say anything further, as hon. Gentlemen opposite will have opportunities of expressing their opinions at a later stage upon it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby took exception, as had likewise been done by other speakers, to the County Councils as not being the most appropriate body for carrying out the provisions of this Bill. If not the County Councils, I want to know what body is more appropriate? The right hon. Gentleman said that unless the Parish Authority was to have control there could not possibly be any life in it. There is one reason which I think is conclusive against the Parish Councils, and that is, that this borrowing power of the parish at the limit fixed would be abso-

lutely inadequate, and that it would not be possible for them to conduct operations of so large a magnitude as is contemplated by the Bill. Then the right hon. Gentleman referred to the question of land being hired as well as the power of purchase. He quoted the Allotments Act as an instance in favour of his argument. But the right hon. Gentleman forgot that in the case of allotments they are only let by the Local Authorities to the occupiers, and are not sold, whereas, in this Bill, one of the main objects we have in view is to sell them, and thus to create an addition to the number of owners of land. A great deal has been said with regard to the limitation which I pointed out was placed on the erection of dwelling-houses upon holdings which did not exceed the annual value of £25. Well, Sir, I am not pledged to that, and I am quite ready to consider any reasonable suggestion on that point. But I would put this question across the Table. Is there to be no limit at all? Because that is the argument which I understand was used by some hon. Gentlemen opposite, notably, by the Member for Aberdeenshire, who asked why a man should not be allowed to build on an acre or half-an-acre of land. I am quite ready to consider the question of the alteration of the present limit, but I repeat that I am totally adverse to any proposal to allow people to erect buildings all over the country on half-acres of ground; and I cannot conceive how the House could agree to such a proposal. I pointed out at the time that as regards these smaller allotments they were designed to meet purely local requirements, and that being so, it is not unreasonable to presume that in a great number of cases the persons to whom they are let or sold will be in possession of houses in which they reside already. But both in regard to this class of holdings and others, hon. Members must also remember this: that in the course of years the instalments will be paid; and whenever the purchase money has been cleared off, they will be free to do with their holdings exactly as they please. The Member for Haddingtonshire referred to something I said in reference to the extravagant prices which had been given in former days for some of the small holdings in Lincolnshire, to which I had referred; and he seemed to find in this statement the argument that compulsion

*Mr. Chaplin*

was all the more necessary. But if I gathered anything from the argument of the hon. Member at all, it was this: that compulsion, according to him, was to be used, and used solely for this purpose—namely, that the land might be taken at a value which was considerably less than it was worth. That is an opinion in which I cannot for a moment coincide. Sir, it has also been urged by many hon. Members on that side of the House that some provision should be made in this Bill by which a certain amount of benefit, at all events, should be reserved to the Local Authorities, who, I understood them to desire, should for all time to come have some permanent interest in the property which they acquire. Well, I own that in preparing this Bill, the object I had in view has been rather to consider the benefit of the people who are to occupy these holdings instead of the benefit of the Local Authorities. Although I am quite willing to listen to anything that may be urged upon that point—and I think there are some matters connected with it of considerable importance—I must say that my views still incline chiefly in that direction. Then my hon. Friend the Member for the Bordesley Division criticised, in a friendly spirit, the amount of the purchase money which the Bill requires to be paid down, and he hopes that I may consider the propriety of relaxing, to some extent, that provision. On that, again, I say that, although I think myself that that probably is the limit at which it could best, or most properly be placed, still that is not a matter of principle, and it is one on which I am open to argument. He also called attention to the great dangers, to the probable and future success of this system which might arise from the action of money-lenders, and from the evils of sub-division and sub-letting. But although I do not pledge myself to the provisions of the Bill, I am strongly under the impression that when he sees the measure, he will find that all these dangers are already guarded against. If they are not, I quite recognise the importance of the subjects to which he has called my attention, and I shall be quite ready to consider them. Then the hon. Member for Essex, sitting behind me asked how the selection was to be made if there were to be an enormous demand for these holdings. Well, I am rather glad to find that h

takes so hopeful a view of the operation of the Bill, and I think it will be time to consider what arrangements are to be made for such contingencies when they arise; but, under the circumstances, it seems to me that it is a matter which may well be left to the discretion and the judgment of the County Council, which is composed of men of business perfectly competent to deal with all matters of that kind as they arise. The Member for Merionethshire called attention to the small holdings in Wales which are connected with large grazing areas and in mountain districts of the country; and he desired me specially to direct my attention to those points, which I shall be exceedingly glad to do. But the hon. Gentleman spoke also of the enormous risks to the Local Authorities which will be incurred under the provisions of this Bill. I cannot agree with him upon that point at all. I am not aware of the enormous risks which, under any circumstances, the Local Authority would be called upon to encounter; and indeed, if I were of that opinion, I should not have felt myself justified in proposing any measure which would possibly have that effect. Nor do I think that he has any reasonable ground for the supposition. I take Clause 11 of the Bill, and I find that that clause provides that the County Council shall not acquire land under this Act save at such price that, in the opinion of the Council, all expenses incurred by the Council in relation to land will be recouped out of the purchase money of the land sold by the Council, or, in the case of land let, out of the rent; and they shall fix the purchase money or the rent at such reasonable amount as will, in their opinion, guard them against loss. Well, I think that is a reasonable provision, and one which ought to have the effect which it is intended to have, of relieving the County Council of the enormous risk.

MR. T. ELLIS: They must accept the risk of the price.

MR. CHAPLIN: Of course they must buy the land by agreement, and must take it at the market value. It will be open to them to buy as it will be for me to sell, and I hope that in some circumstances I myself will be able to sell some land for holdings at a price which will be mutually agreeable to the purchaser.

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

and to myself. The Member for Kirkcudbright asked me if the Bill would apply to the two countries. Yes, Sir; the Bill applies to Scotland as well as to England; and I am glad to think that that proposal meets with the favour of the numerous Members representing Scotland who have taken part in the Debate to-night.

MR. A. SUTHERLAND: Does it apply to Scotland without any exception whatever?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, without exception. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Great Grimsby spoke of a perpetual quit-rent. That is a subject which has received the support of many other Members; and he made proposals to me which would have the effect, to some extent at all events, of varying the provisions under which, as at present in the Bill, the purchase money is to be paid. I own that, so far as I have been able to consider the matter up to the present, I prefer the provisions in the Bill to the provisions he has suggested. But I entirely agree with him as to the inexpediency of lending money to the purchaser for the purpose of making buildings. The hon. Member for Scarborough and the hon. Member for Greenwich referred to Councils of boroughs; and they expressed some apprehension that, in the first place, the Borough Council would be overridden by the County Council; and I think I understood the hon. Member to complain that the County of London was entirely excluded from the operation of the Bill. As far as I understand the measure myself, that is not the case. The 1st clause provides that "if the Council of any county are of opinion that there is a demand for small holdings," &c., they may proceed to put the Bill in operation; and the definitions of the Bill provide this: that the expression "County Council" shall include the Council of a county borough; and therefore, I think these fears will be allayed. Now, Sir, I think I have dealt with most of the observations which have been made in the course of this Debate.

MR. ESSLEMONT: What about the question of the rate?

MR. CHAPLIN: I am afraid I quite forget what the question was.

2 Q



MR. ESSLEMONT: My question was whether this Bill would stereotype the rate, according to the Scotch Local Government Bill, by dividing it between the occupier and the proprietor, or whether it would fall entirely on the proprietor.

MR. CHAPLIN: I apprehend it will follow what is the custom in Scotland.

SIR C. J. PEARSON: Yes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPLIN: The point ought to have attracted my attention more closely perhaps, but I think it is exactly as my right hon. Friends have stated, that in Scotland it will be a divided rate, following the practice which is usual there. Well, Sir, in regard to any other questions which may have been raised in the course of this discussion, some of which it is quite possible I have omitted, I can only say that before we proceed to a further stage of this Bill, they shall receive, one and all, my careful consideration; and, to some extent I have no doubt, I may be able to meet the views of hon. Members.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: What about confining the buildings on the small holdings to people who actually live in the locality?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes; that is so. The Bill provides at present that the small holdings are to be purchased by the County Council for the labouring population in the county, and for persons who are resident in the county, and who desire themselves to cultivate a holding. But that is a matter I will take into consideration, and upon which I should be sorry to commit myself at present.

MR. F. S. STEVENSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman say where the money to provide buildings is to come from?

MR. CHAPLIN: I think I have explained the intentions of the Government with regard to buildings in the opening statement I made. The adaptation of the buildings in the Bill will be included as part of the purchase money.

MR. ROWNTREE: I am sorry that my question was not clear, but I asked whether the non-county boroughs were to

be virtually non-existent, and placed entirely under the County Councils.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, Sir.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and Mr. Long.

Bill presented, and read first time [Bill 183.]

## NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

### MOTION FOR LEAVE.

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. JACKSON, Leeds, N. Mr. Speaker, in asking leave to introduce the Bill for dealing with the question of education in Ireland, I may perhaps be allowed to refer very shortly to the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and which cause us to have to deal with this question of education. The House is aware that last year a grant of money was made, the result of which has been practically the freeing of education in England and Scotland. Following that grant there has been placed at the disposal of Ireland a sum which I may call, for the purpose of shortness, the equivalent grant for Ireland; and this, therefore, seems to me an opportunity for attempting to deal with a very important question, and putting, if possible, elementary education in Ireland on a broader and, I hope, a more efficient basis. Sir, the House is aware that the question of education in Ireland is one in which the Irish people take a very great and a very deep interest. For a long time, in fact, Ireland made more progress in its educational machinery, at one period of its history, than this country. Since 1831, when the National Education Commissioners were established, we have been indebted to the National Education Commissioners for very great and very valuable services; and I would desire to take this opportunity of expressing a sense of appreciation of the valuable work which has been done by that body, a body almost unique in Ireland, being a body which depends entirely for its reward upon its own conscientious conviction of duty discharged, a body which has won the respect of all the people who have been brought into contact with

it, and which, in another degree, has set, I think, a great example, an example of great encouragement—I mean the fact that we have there a body, differing it may be in political principles, differing sharply—it is the fact—in their religious principles; and yet, so far as I know, there has never been any occasion on which difficulties have arisen either from politics or from religion in connection with that important administration. This, Sir, I think is a very encouraging feature, and one which redounds very much to the credit of the body of the Commissioners, whom we call the National Educational Commissioners of Ireland. They have carried on their duties under great difficulties sometimes. They have had great difficulties to contend with; or rather, perhaps, I might say, they have not had the great advantages which have been possessed by those who have had to discharge the duties connected with education either in this country or in Scotland. Since the year 1872 the average attendance in the national schools in Ireland has shown a steady and continuous increase. This may be due partly to the fact that at that time there was introduced a system which gave to the teachers some interest in the results of their work. Be that as it may, I want to press this point upon the attention of the House: that in 1872 practically the average attendance in Ireland, compared with the population of Ireland, ran neck and neck with the average attendance in England. Since that time, notwithstanding a diminishing population, the average attendance in the Irish national schools has shown a gradual and almost continuous increase. I may give the House just three or four figures which show the position. In 1872 the number of children in average attendance was 355,000, leaving out the odd figures; in 1876 it was 416,000; in 1880 it was 468,000; and in 1890 it was 489,000. Taken, as I say, in conjunction with the fact that during this period there has been a diminishing population, these results are not entirely unsatisfactory, especially when we bear in mind—and I ask leave to point this out to the House—that the conditions of the systems in Ireland and in England are not the same. There is a considerable difference in the systems. In England the unit

with which the English Educational Department has to deal is rather the Local Authority. Practically, the English Department deals only with the questions of inspection and of certificates. In Ireland the relations of the State to education are very different. The Education Commissioners in Ireland not only deal with the individual schools, but they regulate and fix the salaries of the various classes of teachers in these schools; and, therefore, they have a far larger responsibility as regards the question of education generally than has the Education Department in this country. I need not remind the House that, whilst speaking roundly, the State contributes in England and Scotland about two-fifths of the cost of education; the State contributes in Ireland about four-fifths of the cost of education. In Ireland the remuneration of the teachers is, as I have said, fixed by the Education Commissioners, and they are brought, therefore, more directly in contact with the individual teachers and the individual schools. There is, again, another point to which I must make reference in passing; and that is, that the question of religion in Ireland has a very considerable influence on the question of education. It is true that the system in Ireland was planned and intended to provide for and to promote what has been called “combined secular and separate religious instruction.” But it is also true that by the continuous efforts, both of the Protestants and of the Roman Catholics, there has been the gradual growth of un-mixed schools; and the result is that we have in Ireland what almost amounts practically to a system of denominational education.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

\*MR. JACKSON: I know my hon. Friend wishes—I will not say believes—that that was not the fact. But my hon. Friend knows that this tendency has been growing, and not from one side only but from both sides. There has been an increasing disposition, both on the part of the Roman Catholics and of the Protestants, to provide separate schools wherever they had a number of children sufficient to enable them to ask

for a separate school to be provided. Speaking personally, and expressing only my own individual opinion, I regret that such should be the fact. I believe that the mixed schools have been of great service. The example that I have just quoted—of the body of Educational Commissioners themselves—of the good service they have performed in Ireland, leads me to the conclusion, along with other circumstances which have come to my knowledge, that it would be to the advantage of Ireland, it would be to the advantage of both Parties and of both denominations, that they should be brought together in contact as much as possible, and, by experience, taught that they could live and work together, each of them rendering good service to the State. I come now to a point of still greater importance, and that is the question of attendance at the schools. I need not remind the House that in 1870, when the Education Act was passed for this country, there was instituted at that time a system of what was called compulsory attendance. For a period of time it was what I may call optional upon the Local Bodies to adopt it or not, and for a time there was no very general application of it. But in 1876, I think it was, an Act was passed which made the bye-laws compulsory; and I will give the House one or two figures which show the extraordinary strides which the average attendance at the schools in this country made from the particular date to which I have referred. It is true that Ireland was excluded, I would say, from the compulsory clauses—I had almost said from the benefits of the compulsory clauses—of that Act. In 1872, then, the number of children examined in England was 661,000, again leaving out the odd figures, which represented 2·86 of the population of the country. In 1876 that percentage rose from 2·86 to 4·69 of the population. In 1880 it rose to 7·44 of the population; in 1884 it rose to 8·63 of the population; in 1890 it rose to 8·83 of the population. Perhaps the results will impress themselves more upon the minds of hon. Members of this House if I give just these five

*Mr. Jackson*

figures showing the average attendance at the schools in these periods. In 1872 the average attendance in the English schools was 1,314,000; in 1876 it was 1,984,000; in 1880 it had risen to 2,594,000; and in 1890 it had risen to 3,717,000. Sir, these are remarkable figures, and they show what an enormous stride was made in the average attendance in the schools of this country following upon the measure which was taken at that time. In 1890—and this is almost the last figure that I shall quote. But let me first say that, as I have already told the House, in 1872 the average attendance in England and Ireland respectively, compared with the population, was what I have called neck and neck. In 1890 the average attendance, as compared with the numbers on the register in England, equalled nearly 80 per cent.; whilst in Ireland the average attendance, in proportion to the number on the rolls of the whole of Ireland, was not quite 60 per cent.; and therefore the position is this: that whilst they were relatively equal in 1872, in 1890 they had fallen away in Ireland until they were 20 per cent. behindhand. I may put the figures in another way, which I think will bring them more clearly home to Members in this House. If you take the population of the respective countries, and test the average attendance compared with the population of the three countries, these are the facts. Taking the population of England at 29,000,000, we have an average attendance in the schools of 3,750,000, or 12·9 per cent. of the population. In Scotland, with a population of 4,000,000, an average attendance of 519,000 children, or 13 per cent. of the population. Bearing in mind that Scotland perhaps compares, in some respects, more nearly with Ireland than it does with England—for there are districts in Scotland remote and difficult of access, which possibly may have thrown the calculation a little on the other side—what are the facts in Ireland? With a population of 4,700,000, you have an average attendance of about 490,000, or about 10·4 per cent. of the population.

MR. KNOX: Is the right hon. Gentleman speaking of the last Census?

\*MR. JACKSON: I take the estimate from the Census of 1891, which puts the

population of Ireland at 4,700,000, and I take the average attendance during the year 1890, giving a little turn to it because it has rather increased since.

MR. J. O'KELLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he is using the same Census for the three populations?

\*MR. JACKSON: Yes, Sir; but now let me put the figures in another way. Supposing you apply to Ireland the figures which I have shown in England and Scotland, namely, 13 per cent. you get this result: that 13 per cent. of the 4,700,000 ought to give you an average attendance in your schools of 611,000; but you have about 490,000, and therefore the net result is that you have from 110,000 to 120,000 children in Ireland who ought to be in school, and who are not in school. Now, Sir, I think if any figures could convince the Members of this House that it is necessary to devise some means by which we can bring into the national schools in Ireland the children who ought to be there, the figures I have quoted are conclusive on that point.

MR. M. J. KENNY: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the number of pupils who present themselves annually for examination?

\*MR. JACKSON: Well, I believe it would in no sense alter the proportion I have given, and it certainly would not affect the percentage, however good. I take the hon. Member's point to be this. I can imagine his saying: Though the attendance may not be so good in Ireland, the quality of education is better, because we pass a large percentage in examinations. But my answer to him would be at once that if the material is so good, and if the teaching is so good, why should you not bring within the scope of it the whole of the children who are capable of being brought. I think these figures point to the fact that we must devise some means by which we can bring within the education facilities which are provided in Ireland this large body of children who, at present, suffer from the want of it, and this points clearly in the direction that one of the

measures to be taken is to provide in some form for applying to Ireland the principle of compulsory attendance. The idea of applying compulsory attendance to Ireland is not new to the House. In 1877, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, who was at that time a Member of the House, brought forward a Motion implying the principle of compulsory attendance in its application to Ireland. That Motion was—I will not say refused, but he was appealed to, as we are from time to time, to be satisfied with the discussion—and a very interesting discussion it was, as anyone will see who reads it now—and with having raised the important question, and he was satisfied with having done so. In 1883 he brought forward again a somewhat similar Motion, which affirmed the principle of compulsory attendance, coupled with a condition that possibly it might be necessary in some districts to modify it in its application to Ireland. That Motion was accepted unanimously by this House. In 1885 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs, who at that time filled the office of Chief Secretary, introduced to this House a Bill which not only embodied the principle of compulsory attendance, but also provided for several other matters connected with education in Ireland. The principle was not only recognised, but it was also applied; and I think I may say that in recent years we have witnessed in many quarters of great influence a great change in the direction of the acceptance of the principle of compulsion. I have seen lately a report of an interesting speech, made by the Bishop of Limerick, in which he accepts, as I take it, the principle of compulsion. It is true he points out that he thinks that in applying this principle to Ireland there should be careful consideration of the varying conditions of Ireland, and with that I have no reason to find fault. It is the duty of those who propose legislation of that kind to take into account the different conditions, and as far as possible to propose measures which are likely to create the least friction and be the most beneficial. If we could once get the principle of compulsory attendance tried in Ireland, I think no one would deny that the value of it must be very great. It is not only

that you get into your schools a larger number of children in average attendance, but from an educational point of view you have the still more important fact that you get more regular and continuous attendance in your schools, and that is a matter of very great importance. In the Bill I am asking to introduce we have endeavoured to provide, as far as we can, a system of compulsory attendance which, whilst we attempt to apply it to certain parts of Ireland without delay, shall, at the same time, possess a certain amount of elasticity, and of consideration for the various conditions of the population of Ireland. I see my hon. Friend the Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) shakes his head, but I would appeal to him, if it is necessary to do so, to consider this: It is as clear as daylight that if you will once apply to any portion of Ireland the principle of compulsory attendance, and see its beneficial effects, there can be no doubt that the average attendance—the improved attendance—in those districts will be such that no other district in Ireland will long remain without the same advantages. Therefore, I attach more importance, it may be, to the introduction and acceptance of the principle than to its immediate application throughout the whole length and breadth of Ireland. But there is another reason which I shall allude to presently, which will explain to some extent why we propose to take the course we do. In this Bill—and it follows the system in England, and also, I may say, the lines of the Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman in 1885—we propose to make it the duty of the parent to send his child to school between the ages of 6 and 14. We propose to make it illegal to employ children at all under 11 years, and also to make it illegal to employ them between 11 and 14 years of age, unless they get a certificate of proficiency. I may say that this part of the Bill applies—

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Does it apply to the agricultural districts?

\*MR. JACKSON: This part of the Bill, I was going to say, applies, and applies immediately, to towns under Corporations and towns under Town

Mr. Jackson

Commissioners. I believe it may be stated, speaking broadly, that that represents only one-fourth of the population of Ireland. But one reason why we have adopted this plan is that the means for enforcing this compulsory attendance is to be provided by the School Attendance Committee appointed by the Local Authority. The Local Authority in the case of the Corporations of towns we have ready to our hands; and we provide in the Bill that all Local Authorities created in the future, whether County Councils or Baronial Councils, may apply this part of the Act to their districts. Therefore we are making, at present, arrangements for the towns, and we are making provision that as soon as the Local Government Bill is passed, the Local Authorities so set up shall have power to apply this part of the Act, and so cover all the districts in Ireland. But I have said that the School Attendance Committee is to be appointed by the Local Authority, and we have thought it desirable to provide some elasticity as regards the attendance to be given, in order to comply with the Act. We recognise that it may be necessary and desirable that we should not exact possibly the same number of attendances in the agricultural districts in Ireland that you exact in the town population; and in order to give that elasticity, we propose to leave to the Education Commissioners the power to determine and regulate the number of attendance which it is necessary to make in each district within the area of each School Attendance Committee. That, I think, will give the elasticity which will meet the views of the hon. Member for South Tyrone. In the Bill of 1885 it was proposed that the number of attendances should be 150. Well, now, 150 may be a very good number or it may not for all parts of Ireland, but we leave it to the Education Commissioners. The tendency will be always to screw up the attendance to that which is found to be possible in the very best attended schools in Ireland. Therefore, it will work automatically in the direction of screwing up the attendances from time to time.

**MR. J. MORLEY:** Do we understand that the application of compulsion is to be optional on the part of the Jounty Council when it is created, but not optional on the Town Commissioners?

**\*MR. JACKSON:** As the Bill is drawn it stands with the word "may." It is compulsory as regards towns under Town Councils and Town Commissioners, and it stands with the word "may" in the Bill in regard to its application to Local Authorities to be constituted hereafter. But I quite appreciate the point of the right hon. Gentleman, and if I can feel sure that I shall have his assistance in turning that word "may" into "shall," I shall be glad to avail myself of it. Now, Sir, I come to another part of the Bill which is, perhaps, after all, the part which will interest most Members of the House, and that is the financial part; and here, Sir, I must take the opportunity of reminding the House of the position in which we stand as regards Ireland in this matter. We have a sum of about £90,000 due to Ireland for the current financial year—that is to say, for the year ending on the 31st of next month. It is proposed, as hon. Members are aware, to dispose of that £90,000 by means of a vote of this House in the form of a supplementary Estimate, and it may be convenient—and probably hon. Members would prefer—that I should state now how it is proposed to deal with the £90,000. In the time past that Members of this House, the great body of school teachers in Ireland, and others, have been taking considerable interest in the question of teachers' pensions. The question put to me to-day was practically to ask whether, in accordance with the understanding when the Teachers' Pension Fund was established, there had been the usual periodic revision and actuarial calculation showing the present position of the fund. I am sure this House will feel that there would be, and naturally would be, great disappointment on the part of those teachers who have contributed towards that fund, and who are looking forward to the time when they may expect to derive the benefit and pension they have

earned from it, there would be, I say, great disappointment if it were felt that there was any doubt as to the permanence and solvency of the fund. Sir, it is my duty to say that the revision, which the accounts of the fund have recently undergone, has shown that the benefits which have been, or are being given, or the contributions being made, either the one is too great or the other is too small, and the consequence is that the fund shows a tendency towards getting into backwater; and under these circumstances I think there can be no doubt that the duty is imposed upon us, and I think it would be the view of the teachers themselves that this £90,000, which is neither more nor less than a windfall, should be utilised for the purpose of aiding the capital sum of the Teachers' Pension Fund, and it will be my duty to propose to the House that the sum for the current year shall be handed over to the fund for the purpose of improving its position. Now, Sir, we have, further, a sum in round figures for the ensuing year at our disposal of, say, £200,000. The House is aware that this is an equivalent grant to the grant given to England and Scotland, which in England and Scotland produced free schools for the population of those two countries, and I gather, so far as I am able to gather from the opinions of those who are justified in speaking with authority, there is a feeling in Ireland that whatever is done with this money one of our first objects should be, if we cannot free the whole of the schools in Ireland from school pence, we should free the largest portion of them with the money at our disposal. I think I shall be able to show that this proposal is a perfectly reasonable one, and meets with acceptance in the opinions of those to whose opinions great respect attaches. I believe it also meets with the acceptance of all the people of Ireland. I take it there can be no question about its being desirable to the teachers in Ireland, because they would benefit by it. There is no doubt that it is a very important question; and the Bill proposes that, under certain conditions, there shall be a considerable proportion of the schools in Ireland freed from school pence. There have been, I need hardly say, a great many suggestions made for dealing with the £200,000, which have reached me. I have had the

advantage of seeing the report of a great meeting held in Dublin, presided over by the Archbishop of that city, in which was evinced what I suppose is the opinion, mainly, of the Protestants of Ireland. At that meeting there was a very decided expression of opinion in favour of applying the money in the shape of additions to class salaries. I have had the advantage of seeing, following that, the opinions expressed by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in which he took a strong line in the extreme opposite direction, that the money should be granted in the form of capitation grants. I have had the advantage of hearing from a deputation of teachers, who waited upon me, their views as to the particular form they would desire, and so far as I am able to judge, although starting off with the view that it would be desirable to appropriate the money in class salaries, they have modified their views, and are now of opinion that it might be disposed of rightly and properly, partly in one way and partly in the other. They have expressed fears lest, if the whole be given in the form of capitation grant, they may be placed at the will of parents, and their remuneration depend too much on the school fees. Now, I do not think the result of fees on attendance in Ireland shows anything except that it has been beneficial both to the children and the teachers. I have had the advantage of seeing the view taken by the great Presbyterian Body, and also the view recently expressed at a meeting of Roman Catholic Bishops. I should like to mention at this point what appears to me to be rather an important fact, and one which, perhaps, gives us a certain amount of freedom of action, which otherwise we might have felt some difficulty about, and that is the effect in pounds, shillings, and pence of the application of the general methods of distribution of this money on the great divisions of the Roman Catholic and Protestant populations of Ireland. I have had certain calculations made; I have had the question tested in order to ascertain what would be the effect of applying the money wholly in class salaries, what would be the effect of applying the whole of the money in capitation grants, and what would be the effect of applying half in one way and

*Mr. Jackson*

half in the other. I am told that these calculations show that there is practically no difference whatever in the aggregate amount of money which will go to Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively, whichever plan we may adopt. That is a very important matter, I think, because it leaves us, at all events, more freedom, without creating unnecessary friction, without doing injustice to either of these great denominations. It leaves us a little more freedom as regards the distribution.

**MR. O'KELLY** (Roscommon, N.): If the whole of the money were applied to the abolition of school fees what would be the effect? How far would it go?

**\*MR. JACKSON:** I do not quite appreciate the hon. Gentleman's question. I was pointing out—

**MR. O'KELLY:** I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. What would be the effect on the school fees if the whole sum were applied to abolish the fees all over Ireland?

**\*MR. JACKSON:** I did not quite catch the question. I think I may answer it by this fact. He may take it that the whole school fees in Ireland are represented by about £104,000, and therefore to really abolish the whole of the fees would absorb about half the amount in our hands. Well, Sir, I have said that I have had a great many suggestions, but I have not felt it in my power to accept in their entirety any of the proposals that have been made. It has come to my knowledge, and I think it is in the knowledge of a great many of the Members of this House for Ireland, that there has been for some time past a feeling that teachers in Ireland are not very adequately or liberally paid. It has also been brought to my attention that the class of assistant teachers, failing to get beyond that position, may go on for a great number of years on a very small and, I must say, inadequate salary. There are, therefore, little grievances of that kind which, I think, it is desirable to take advantage of this opportunity to endeavour to remedy. We propose to

make an addition to the class salaries of teachers. We propose to make some improvement in the remuneration of assistant teachers who have seven years of service as assistant teachers. We propose to make a little provision in order to improve the position of the smallest schools in Ireland. The smallest schools in Ireland, I will remind the House, are not confined to one denomination; they belong to both denominations, and, therefore, it is not a question of religion. We propose to make a capitation grant practically of the balance. Stated roughly, the apportionment of the money will take the form of half in capitation grants and one-half in the other directions I have indicated. For these benefits which we propose to confer we propose to ask something in return; we propose to ask that all schools, the fees of which do not exceed 6s. per child per annum, shall in future be free from school fees. It may be asked why I have suggested 6s. I will tell the House. I recognise the principle that it is desirable not only to compensate the teacher for the abolition of school fees, but also to give him a little improvement in his position in addition. The total sum at our disposal practically represents 8s. per head on the average attendance. I should have been glad if it had been possible to obtain enough for the abolition up to the point of 6s., but, as hon. Members will see, if that were done the teachers in schools, the fees of which were 8s. per head per annum, would gain no benefit whatever under the Bill. Therefore I have, in order, if you like, to make a compromise—for it is a compromise—adopted 6s. as the limit, in order to leave the teacher something in addition to the compensation that is given for the abolition of school fees. The effect of this distribution will be this—and I must not conceal it from the House—that it will give the greater benefit to the poor districts and the poor schools than to the larger and better schools. I do not know that that in itself is unjust or ought of necessity to be objected to. I have now practically given to the House all the information—

**COLONEL NOLAN:** Anything for the Christian Brothers?

**MR. JACKSON:** I do not know about the Christian Brothers. The Christian Brothers, if they come under

the Act, will benefit by it. I omitted to mention that where there are in Ireland schools paid by capitation grant and not by class salaries, it will, of course, be necessary to make an augmented capitation grant in order to compensate for the addition to the class salaries. I apologise for detaining the House at such length. The question is a most important one. There have been measures, no doubt, from time to time introduced into this House which seemed to be of greater importance, but I venture to think that if we can devise some means by which the benefits of education shall be extended to the whole of the children of Ireland of school age; if we can bring within its influence the whole of these children, we shall confer, not only upon the children of Ireland a great advantage, but we shall confer upon Ireland itself a great advantage, and I feel that I shall not appeal in vain to the Members of this House when I ask them to help. It may be that in some of its details the Bill may not meet with the unanimous approval of the House. I believe, however, that it is fairly constructed, that it is equitable in its distribution, and I think I may appeal with confidence to the Members of this House to endeavour to make it a success.

\*(10.45.) **MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY** (Londonderry): I am sure we all heard with the deepest interest the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and I am equally sure we are all willing and resolved to give his measure, which he has so lucidly explained, the very fullest consideration. The right hon. Gentleman made a clear statement, but at the same time the Bill is a very complex measure, necessarily a very complex measure, dealing with a complicated question, and in a case like that the clearer the statement in which it is explained the more the difficulties and complications become apparent. Of course, we do not intend to offer any opposition at this stage of the measure, and I am bound to say we recognize very cordially some good things and some benefits in the measure as it has been sketched out by the right hon. Gentleman. At the same time I think there are many faults in it, into the



details of which I shall not go at the present moment. I think the right hon. Gentleman might have made some provision for recognising the great claims of the schools of the Christian Brothers. I did not understand from him that they are included in the benefits of this measure. I think that the standard of seven years for the assistant teachers is surely rather high. Then the right hon. Gentleman made a comparison between the progress of education in Ireland and in England, as shown by the attendance at schools. At one time, he said, they ran neck and neck, which is a very good and clear expression, but that, later on, one went forward—that while England had gone forward, Ireland had fallen back. But is it not a fact that things have taken place in Ireland which made popular education in Ireland at one time less palatable than it was before? Of course, I understand that the right hon. Gentleman compared the national schools of Ireland with the national schools of England. But then again you leave out of the calculation all the teaching under the Christian Brothers, and all the teaching in the many other such voluntary schools of the country; and I fancy if all were put together, the Irish people would be found not behind, not running neck and neck, but even in advance of the education of children in English schools. The right hon. Gentleman spoke at some length on the question of compulsion. I never understood that there was, in Ireland, any absolute objection to the principle of compulsion, provided there was a certain amount of care in the time, the development, and the application of it. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken as to the necessity of elasticity in the application of the principle. What we want to know is, whether the elasticity is to be elastic enough, and whether the elasticity always means that it will be elastic at the right time, and in the right places. Again, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to make his measure a little too much a companion to that valuable measure the Local Government Bill, which is about to be introduced for the extreme benefit of the people of Ireland. I think the right hon. Gentleman made a little too much a *Calais-Douvres* consortship of the two measures in the palliative

*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*

principle to be applied to Ireland. I should recommend the right hon. Gentleman to rest his measure on principles wholly independent of that other measure which it is barely possible may never be passed into law. On the whole, I have to say that we do certainly recognize some points of advantage in this measure. I admit cordially the sincerity of the right hon. Gentleman in his experiment to try and satisfy the wishes of all classes of the Irish people, and I can only say that we desire to give the measure full consideration. The matter is a complicated one, but I can assure the House that we are anxious to give the measure fair and full hearing.

(10.50.) COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I do not wish to intrude upon the time of the House at any length upon this question. I can only say that I agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in recognising that this measure is well intended, and may result in great advantage to the people of Ireland. At the same time, I know how very different a measure may be when we see it in black and white, to what we think it is when laid before the House by a right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench, and I shall therefore reserve any decided opinion until I shall see it presented to the House in the form of a Bill. One suggestion I earnestly agree with, and that is as to the use proposed to be made of the £90,000. I think that no reasonable person could object to it. As to what should be done about the other sum, I should like to see how the figures work out. At the same time, I think the Bill is one which, with some little alterations that will be made in Committee, may be rendered a fairly satisfactory measure to all parties in Ireland. I do not intend to delay the House with any further remarks.

(10.55.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I am sorry I cannot agree with the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the £90,000. I think that is the weak point of the whole Bill. The Chief Secretary for Ireland called it a windfall, and it appears that when the Chief Secretary for Ireland gets a windfall he can do what he likes with it. That is his view. I do not think it at all. It is

Ireland's share of taxation on whisky and tobacco, and whisky is taxed in Ireland because it is one of our chief products.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Scotch.

**COLONEL NOLAN:** I do not thank my Government for the share of that sum. I think Ireland has got a little less than her share, and I think it was not quite reasonably calculated as to its being windfall.

**MR. JACKSON:** I did not mean that it was so much a windfall to Ireland; what I meant was that it was more a windfall to the teachers.

**COLONEL NOLAN:** My point is this, that he has not improved the pensions, as he hopes he will in the Bill. If he would increase the pensions, or make them commence at an earlier age, it would be an advantage to the teachers, but all he has done is to use this money, which is purely Irish money, to remedy the errors of his own calculations. It was not the Irish Members who settled the rate of pensions. They have made their calculations wrong, and they now propose to put the matter right by using this £90,000, without giving any additional benefit to the teachers. Nothing additional is to be done for the teachers; they are to get no higher rate of pension. It is not to date from an earlier time, as the Treasury made all these wrong calculations with our money.

**MR. GOSCHEN:** It is not the Treasury that made these calculations. The hon. Member will find he is in error, and that the Treasury was not responsible.

**MR. T. M. HEALY:** Who then?

**COLONEL NOLAN:** As the right hon. Gentleman never allowed an Irishman to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, we are, of course, in a certain amount of a mistake. But I need not go further. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer may toss over responsibility from one Department to another, but it seems to us in Ireland to be pretty much the same thing. I dare say he is playing on some official fence between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Educational Department in Ireland, who are responsible to the Treasury. Of course the Chancellor

of the Exchequer has a natural wish to disclaim, and for his own peace of mind I will grant the disclaimer; but the English Government is responsible, and the Irish Members have no responsibility, as they have had nothing to do with it. I must say that the Treasury has muddled away this money, and I repeat, either the pensions should be raised, or they should be made to date from an earlier age. On the whole, I think the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary as to the £200,000 a year very judicious, and I think he has hit the medium pretty fairly between class and capitation. I am sorry that nothing has been done for the Christian Brothers, and am glad that the hon. Member for Londonderry has referred to that point. I would like to explain that the Christian Brothers are the link between primary and secondary education in Ireland, and they do not get a penny of public money except under the head of science and art. The reason why they do not get any money is because they insist upon having certain Christian emblems in their schools. They represent the voluntary principle in Ireland, and yet they are excluded from all benefit under the Bill. I think this argument was used by the Bishop of Limerick, as to how the system of the Chief Secretary is going to work: that the Christian Brothers are in towns and only in towns, and in a great many towns there are no other Catholic schools. So that in the very place where you are going to make education compulsory you will have chiefly the Christian Brothers' schools, and you are going to compel the children to attend those schools; the Christian Brothers are to receive no benefit. The Christian Brothers' schools in Ireland represent the voluntary principle in Ireland. The plate goes round in the chapels, and subscriptions are sent in. The Christian Brothers give their own time practically for nothing; but they are kept and supported by the voluntary principle in Ireland. If you drive all the children into these schools, we say, at any rate, give us something. These are the very people excluded from pensions and benefits under this Bill. As to the general question of compulsion, I think the Chief Secretary has been rather in a hurry to apply the principle, not only to

the towns, but to the country. I am speaking entirely for myself, though not wholly for myself, but as at present instructed by my constituency. It is possible my constituency might say that they wished to be compelled to send their children to school, but my impression is that they would object; but it is possible that they may change their minds on the subject. But I should say at present that the rural population do not want to be driven into the schools. The right hon. Gentleman should recollect that in Ireland the distances from the schools are long, and the climate generally wet. I would advise the right hon. Gentleman for the present not to apply the compulsory system in the rural districts, unless the rural population vote for it.

MR. JACKSON: That is the proposal of the Bill.

COLONEL NOLAN: I know that is the proposal of the Bill, but some hon. Gentlemen seem to be anxious to go further. What I say is, the Chief Secretary has been urged to go further than the Bill; I advise him not to go further than the Bill at present. There is another point in the way of statistics, which I hope the Chief Secretary will look into. He seems to think that the number of children of school-going age bears the same relation to the population in Ireland as they do in England and Scotland. There is a very great difference in Ireland.

MR. JACKSON: That is so. As a matter of fact, the number of children is what is called within the total on the rolls, and, therefore, is within the number having made one attendance at the school.

COLONEL NOLAN: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has quite grasped my point. My point is this: I do not know that the number of children in relation to the population is the same in Ireland as in England and Scotland. With regard to the number in attendance, the whole population of England and Scotland is chiefly urban, and the whole population of Ireland is chiefly rural, so that I do not think it fair to compare the two. Of course, there are dis-

*Colonel Nolan*

tricts in Scotland—for instance, the Highlands—where the difficulties as to distances and climate are as great as in Ireland. I think the right hon. Gentleman should correct his figure with reference chiefly to the rural population. However, on the whole, I really think the Bill might have been very much worse. It is a very good Bill with the exception of the provision about the £90,000, which is simply being confiscated. I think this is a Bill which ought to be passed; and I should like to see it passed during the present Session. I hope the Government will give priority to this Education Bill over the Local Government Bill, because, whatever may be said in favour of the Local Government Bill, it does not bring us any money whatever.

(11.10.) MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I agree with my hon. and gallant Friend that the Bill before the House might easily be a worse one, but I am very far from saying that it could not have been better in some of its details. I am sure that when it arrives at the Committee stage we shall be able to make it more perfect than it is. I am glad to find that at last the poor teachers of Ireland and their claims are going to be recognised. With that part of the Bill I heartily agree; although I should be very sorry indeed if any surplus in the hands of the Government should be entirely devoted to the amelioration of the condition of the teachers, because the National School teachers of Ireland, for whom I have pleaded in this House for many years, are not above human nature, and very possibly they might desire more than we should be inclined to give them. For year after year I have endeavoured to press upon Government after Government, and particularly the Government now in Office, the grievances of that meritorious and well-deserving body, the National School teachers of Ireland. I was told by officials sitting upon that Bench from which this Bill has been fulminated to-night that they had no grievances whatever; that all their cases had been considered, and there was no want that was not supplied. Yet, now we have the Chief Secretary for Ireland standing up in his place an

opposing a Bill recognising the claims of the people at one time denied, and proposing to satisfy them by the application of £10,000. The only thing I have to say out that is this—"better late than never." I welcome the proposals; and, far as I am concerned, that portion of the Bill, at least, shall receive no opposition whatever. With regard to the principle of compulsion, I have to say that I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary will stick to his principle of elasticity. In Ireland—and we know our people well—there is no necessity, or almost no necessity, for applying the principle of compulsion. The intention of an Irish parent is to educate his children better than he has been educated himself, and place them in a position higher than the position he has occupied in social or commercial life. That has been the main tendency of the Irish character, and where there has been any want of it, or where it could not be applied by the intention of the parent, it would be cruel to enforce it by any legislation. If the Irish parent has not been able to fulfil his desire with regard to the education of his children, it is because the means and other conditions were not favourable to such intentions; it is because the schools were too far away, or the children too badly clad; or because they had no boots to their feet, and perhaps sometimes no food to eat, that there was any halting in that respect. I therefore hope the right hon. Gentleman will stick to his elasticity with regard to the application of the principle of compulsory education. There is one disappointment that I feel with regard to this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman does not provide in the Bill in the slightest degree for any application of the funds towards technical education in these primary schools. The Irish people are absolutely devoid of technical education. Ireland suffers from the want of manufactures. Ireland is on the eve of the resuscitation of her manufactures; and there is no provision in that Bill for the purpose of applying any of the funds at the disposal of the Government in order to promote technical education in Ireland. It not only does not provide in the primary National Schools for the promotion of technical education, but it absolutely denies it to the only National Schools in Ireland that

provide the people with technical education. The only schools in Ireland where an Irish boy is taught to handle a tool, by which he may have to provide himself with a future, are the Christian Brothers' Schools of Ireland. In the Christian Brothers' Schools you have technical education, and not in your so-called National Schools, upon which you are going to expend £200,000—£90,000 in pensions. But perhaps the English Government do not wish the Irishman to go into the world fully equipped with technical knowledge? ("No!") It appears very like it. The hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. William Johnston) says "no." But I will put it on a lower ground. Why not give the Irishman a technical education for the sake of the development of the resources of his own country? I certainly should have thought that any Government who wished to come at the root of education in Ireland should establish through all the primary schools of Ireland—those that were established on the National School system and those that were not—technical schools to be subsidised by Imperial funds. There is a great want in Ireland in this respect. In this Bill there was a splendid opportunity for the Government to supply that want. There was machinery in existence which they might have used. The Christian Brothers alone form the true national schools in the towns of Ireland, and any system of State aid which does not take them into account, is halting, false, and will not go to the root of the evil you desire to deal with. I reserve further criticism of the Bill; there are some details I do not like, but the Bill is in many respects an excellent measure, though it is not perfect. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will receive with a generous mind the representations made on behalf of existing representative institutions in Ireland, and will endeavour to make the Bill perfect.

\*(11.23.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyne, S.): The right hon. Gentleman in opening his speech, said, that this subject has aroused very strong feelings in Ireland. It has aroused very strong feelings indeed, as more than one Government has learned to its cost. As regards the Bill, I am bound to say it

is rather better from my own point of view than I expected. I am glad the right hon. Gentleman paid a tribute to that much maligned body, the Commissioners of National Education, a body which during 60 years has carried on a great work and done it, with certain drawbacks, uncommonly well. There is one point—though I am not going to commit myself to anything in the Bill—which I should like to comment upon. The right hon. Gentleman drew attention to the fact that although this system of national education was a mixed system, yet by the consent alike of Protestant and of Catholic it was rapidly becoming denominational. I challenge the fact itself, and I challenge the description of the fact. There were 8,000 schools on the operation list in 1890, and close upon 4,000 of these were mixed schools where Protestants and Roman Catholics received the same secular education. When he says to the House of Commons that Protestants are becoming more and more denominational, I wish to point out that there are at least 500,000 Protestants in Ulster who will be surprised to hear this; because if there is one thing that the Presbyterians of Ulster have been strong upon, it is this system of mixed education, in which they are supported by the Methodists, the Unitarians, and three-fourths of the Protestant Episcopalians of Ulster. In the Episcopalian as well as in the Presbyterian Church there is a very strong feeling in favour of this system. At all events the system is not denominational, and in the second place the Protestants, as a whole, are not in favour of denominational education. I do not wish to enter upon the question of compulsion; but I will say that the only objection I have to the Bill, is that it does not go far enough. I think the rural districts will have a right to complain, and that the rural districts in Ulster will complain, and the teachers all over Ireland will complain of this, because it will have an effect upon the capitation grant. As to the distribution of the £200,000 as between the capitation grant and the class salaries, I am agreeably surprised that the right hon. Gentleman appears to have taken a little bit of everybody's advice, and the only

*Mr. T. W. Russell*

persons left out in the cold are the Christian Brothers. The answer to that is, let them do as the monastery schools do, and the convents do; and they will come under the national grant at once, but so long as they insist upon a Catholic atmosphere in the school, they cannot expect the rules of the National Board, upon which the system is founded, to be broken down to suit them. I complain that nothing has been done in respect of technical education; there can be no question that the system of education in Ireland can be improved. The books are old-world institutions, and the whole thing wants to be taken to pieces and re-modelled. No place is given to cookery and domestic economy, subjects which ought to be taught in the large towns especially. In Dublin, Limerick, and Cork the people are not fed, and they are not fed because their wives and daughters do not know anything of cooking. Reserving to myself the right to criticise the details at a later stage, I can only say that I am agreeably disappointed. This is a much better Bill than I expected, and it is a much worse Bill than was expected by gentlemen below the Gangway.

(11.32.) **MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.):** The hon. Member who has just sat down has, in somewhat dubious terms, blessed the Bill. In the first place, the hon. Member has taken the Chief Secretary to task for not making provision for technical education. Some improvement was made in technical education during the administration of the Chief Secretary's predecessor, especially in the matter of sewing, and I well remember that the only opposition to that came from the hon. Member for South Tyrone and his friends. We all know the difficulties of starting a system of technical education where you have a large number of rural schools. I quite agree that something should be done, but I confess I cannot see how anything can be done in connection with the Bill which is already overloaded. As regards compulsion, the right hon. Gentleman said that by the Act of 1876 it was made compulsory upon School Attendance Committees to make bye-laws in England; but in England

instead of rushing headlong into compulsory education the course followed was an extremely cautious and slow one. I am told that in many rural districts in England compulsion is nothing more than a name, and I cannot think the right hon. Gentleman is acting unwisely in confining his Bill to the urban districts. The right hon. Gentleman said he proposed to fix the age at from 6 to 14. I fancy that is rather a longer period than was the case in England originally, so the number of children left at school who are over 14 years of age is larger in Ireland than in England. One thing which should be greatly deprecated, and which I hope the right hon. Gentleman will consider and guard against, is that anything connected with the unpopularity attending the enforcement of other laws should attach to education. If these School Attendance Committees work through the ordinary engines of the law, if, for example, they use the police, it would be possible for them to cause, in many districts, a very general feeling against the attendance altogether amongst considerable classes of the population. Another point of difficulty, and I cannot mention it without the deepest shame, is that in the more Protestant parts of Ulster the Catholics have no representation on a Local Body. In Belfast there is a system of religious exclusion. I avoid the use of stronger words—such as has parallel in no other part of the United Kingdom. In the City of Belfast not one single elected Poor Law Guardian is a Catholic. There is not a single member of the Town Council who is a Catholic.

**MR. JOHNSTON** : Roman Catholics ; do not call them Catholics.

**MR. KNOX** : I do not quarrel about words ; I am stating facts. I say as a Protestant, as a professor, every 12th of July, of the principles of civil and religious liberty, the hon. Member for South Belfast has reason to be ashamed, as I am ashamed, of the conduct of his religionists.

**MR. JOHNSTON** : I am not.

**MR. KNOX** : I go on to state facts in spite of the hon. Member's interruption. Not one single elected member of the Board of Guardians in Belfast is a Catholic, not a single member of the

Town Council is a Catholic. There is just one member of the Water Commission who is a Catholic ; there is not a single member of the Harbour Commission who is a Catholic. In a city containing 70,000 Catholics among its population, there is no representation of Catholics on the Local Governing Bodies. This is a scandal and shame to the City of Belfast, a shame to the Protestant religion, a condition of things I, in common with every right-thinking Protestant, deplore. Having this state of facts to deal with, I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he purposes to give to a body which has shown in the mode in which they are selected their exclusive, if not their intolerant, character, the right to govern in these matters, in the way they would, the non-Protestant—the Catholic—population of Belfast? Everybody except bigots knows that the law of compulsory attendance requires much more careful working than most laws. It is necessary to work it with considerable regard to particular cases, or else you may, in many cases, do a great wrong and make your system generally unpopular. Everybody who sees anything of the working of education laws knows that. You want a sympathetic authority to work it, and can you believe, in the face of these facts, that the Catholic minority would not feel themselves placed under a School Attendance Committee of the Town Council—placed in a position, to put it mildly, of the utmost difficulty? The hon. Member opposite may say, "They can only make the children go to school." But I do say this : that if attendance is forced, if the law is enforced, without regard to particular cases, without respect to Catholics, while allowing considerable latitude to Protestants, the effect will be disastrous, and there is very great fear that the law enforced in this form would have this effect. I understand the right hon. Gentleman by his Local Government Bill brings in the principle of cumulative voting in county districts in Ireland. It is a point I am not quite certain of, that in rural districts the cumulative vote is introduced, but there is to be no change in the system of voting in boroughs?

**MR. JACKSON** assented.

**MR. KNOX** : Well, if there is a case where cumulative voting is required it is

in the City of Belfast, for it is the one place in Ireland where you have a considerable minority not represented at all on Public Bodies, and in the matter of education there is more to be said for cumulative voting than in any other respect. I do say here you must, if you are to have the law working fairly, give some representation by some means to the Roman Catholic minority on the School Attendance Committee of Belfast, a representation to which they are fairly entitled. The City of Belfast was divided into five wards at the time when it was much smaller than it is to-day. I do not think that hon. Members should be proud of that. There has been no re-adjustment of wards; the city still remains divided into five, and the reason why there has been no re-adjustment is that with such, the Catholics would gain representation. It is in order to prevent this representation that the wards have been left in their old and now inconvenient method of division. Therefore, looking at the facts, it is incumbent on the right hon. Gentleman, if he does not intend to inflict great hardship on a large body of the population, to make some further provision for increased elasticity in his scheme.

MR. JACKSON: It is provided for.

MR. KNOX: I am glad to hear it is provided for, that some provision for religious liberty is made. I venture to hope, also, that the School Attendance Committee will be so constituted that it will not be required to give to any unpopular officials, but to an entirely new body, the carrying out of the law carefully. It may then do great good to Ireland; but if not applied with the utmost consideration for diverse interests, and, I may say, the touching feelings of various denominations, it will end in disaster. The right hon. Gentleman's successor in the post of Secretary to the Treasury has visited the schools of the Christian Brothers in Cork. Now, I want to make a fair offer to the Chief Secretary. Will he allow his right hon. Colleague the Secretary to the Treasury to decide whether or not the Christian Brothers' Schools are worthy of State aid? These schools are carried on under great difficulties, and

*Mr. Knox*

they will find their difficulties increased under this Bill. It is surely necessary in making provision for compulsory education to make provision for voluntary schools? There are voluntary schools of the Protestant persuasion in the North. None of my hon. Friends object to seeing these included in provisions made for the schools of the Christian Brothers. Your Bill will put a greater strain upon voluntary schools, and it is right that these schools should have some grant from Imperial resources. If they only receive support in the same way voluntary schools receive it in England we shall be content. I hope that these various points, which need careful consideration, have been met in a way that will make the Bill work for the advantage of education in Ireland.

(11.48.) MR. M. HEALY (Cork): I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has any reason to complain of the reception his Bill has met with from this quarter of the House. I do not now intervene for the purpose of offering any hostile criticism, nor do I intend to enter upon any detailed examination of the proposals which have been explained to us; but I would like to verify some of the observations which have fallen from my hon. Friends on some of the points they have dealt with. Unquestionably, there will be great disappointment in Ireland that the right hon. Gentleman has not taken this opportunity of dealing with the question of the schools of the Christian Brothers. It may be said the Bill does not touch the question of denominational as distinct from undenominational teaching, but simply introduces the principle of compulsion, making certain financial arrangements; and, therefore, no occasion arises for the change indicated. Now, there are many parts of Ireland, and many small towns, where the principle of compulsion will come into operation, where the only schools available are these very schools of the Christian Brothers, but which will be exempt from all benefit under the Bill. Take Lismore, in Waterford, as an example. Some 20 years ago the National School there was abolished and a Christian Brothers' school introduced in its place, largely by the aid of the late Duke of Devonshire, who handed over the school building, which was his

erty, to the community of the  
ristian Brothers, and contributed  
y handsomely to their establishment.  
w, are you going to compel the  
abitants to send their children to  
s school, and compel the school  
nagers to receive them, and, at the  
se time, exclude the school from all  
esit under this scheme? The hon.  
ntleman (Mr. T. W. Russell) says a  
tholic atmosphere is not to be  
sourced—

**MR. T. W. RUSSELL:** Not to be  
sted into a National system of educa-  
n.

**MR. M. HEALY:** The hon. Gentle-  
m objects to the State making any  
yment to any school with a Catholic  
mosphere. But when you have schools  
tended by Catholic children, of Catholic  
rents, and with a Conscience Clause,  
y should you not have a Catholic  
mosphere? If you have schools ex-  
sively of Protestant children, and  
th the protection of a Conscience  
ause, why should you not have a  
rotestant atmosphere? That is all we  
k. The Bishops of Ireland have never  
ked that in schools attended by children  
more than one religion—mixed  
hools—that this relaxation of the  
esent system of the National Board  
ould be introduced. All they ask is  
at purely Catholic schools or purely  
rotestant schools, if they have fulfilled  
e other conditions which are prescribed  
y the National Board, that these schools  
ould not be excluded from pecuniary  
vantage. The hon. Member for South  
yrone has denied the tendency to make  
e national system more and more a  
enominational system, but I appeal to  
e right hon. Gentlemen opposite, Have  
ot repeated declarations of authorities  
the Protestant Episcopal Church,  
ver and over again, made on the subject,  
een in favour—by a large majority in  
avour—of denominational education?  
am quite free to concede that among  
resbyterians the same opinion is held.  
f that be so, if the state of thing is as I  
ave stated, why should not the Govern-  
ment recognise the fact in Ireland, and  
ut an end to this anomaly, by which the  
eaching which does the most for the  
ducation of the Irish children is wholly  
xcluded from any State aid? If this

body, the Christian Brothers, were  
established and teaching in England,  
every school established would be drawing  
result fees. Wherever in England you  
have a Catholic community you have  
schools conducted on precisely the same  
principle as the schools of the Christian  
Brothers, and these schools are drawing  
result fees—are receiving State aid—and  
this the hon. Gentleman objects to  
have applied to Ireland. These  
schools are shut out from State aid  
so far as primary education is  
concerned; but under the Intermediate  
Education Act the schools of the Christian  
Brothers are most successful in passing  
their pupils through examinations and  
getting prizes and result fees. Now, if  
it is right that Government should pro-  
mote the schools of the Christian  
Brothers and give them aid under  
the intermediate education system,  
what principle is involved in refusing  
similar assistance in regard to primary  
education? I do not intend to continue  
this subject; but I think the right hon.  
Gentleman will see that, so long as this  
state of things is persisted in, so long  
must the question of national education  
in Ireland remain unsettled. One other  
word I will add, to express a doubt as  
to whether the body to which is to be  
entrusted the carrying out of the prin-  
ciple of compulsion is the best for the  
purpose. I quite admit it is exceedingly  
difficult to set up in Ireland anything in  
the nature of School Boards, so that  
there is no great choice left; but I do  
think the right hon. Gentleman will find  
that Corporate Bodies elected to look after  
an entirely different class of matters—  
bodies having no dealings, generally  
speaking, with educational matters,  
having totally different functions to dis-  
charge, will be bodies which will not  
effectively discharge the duties the  
right hon. Gentleman intends to cast  
upon them by this Bill. However,  
that is a matter open to argument  
at a later stage, and, having regard  
to the hour, I will not discuss it now.

(11.58.) **MR. M. J. KENNY** (Tyrone,  
Mid): This is a Bill which is of the  
utmost importance to Ireland, and it was  
a late hour when the right hon. Gentle-  
man rose to introduce it, and not many  
Members have had the opportunity of  
making any observations upon it. Con-  
sidering the importance of the subject, I



apprehend the right hon. Gentleman will not object to some further observations from Irish Members. My hon. Friend the Member for Derry (Mr. Mc'Carthy) spoke only for a few minutes, and the Bill was taken in the absence of my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), who has devoted extraordinary attention to the subject with which the Bill deals, and who has been in communication during the past twelve months with the leaders of Catholic education in Ireland on these matters. My hon. Friend has not had an opportunity of speaking. It is a Bill of the widest importance; it proposes the application of a principle perfectly novel in Ireland, and hitherto never required, a principle to which some of us, to some extent, may be opposed. It is perfectly true that the Resolution adopted in 1883, and moved by the then Member for Limerick, pledged the House to support a system of compulsory education, but it was subject to certain modifications, and therefore the principle of absolute compulsion has never been accepted or enforced. The right hon. Gentleman himself, although he accepts in principle, goes through the form of introducing a system of elasticity—

It being Midnight the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed on Thursday next.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### LOCAL COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 165.)

##### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(Mr. Mc'Cartan.)

(12.3.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): In assenting, on the part of the Government, to the second reading now, it must be clearly understood that I reserve full right to put down Amendments at a later stage.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

Mr. M. J. Kenny

#### MILITARY LANDS CONSOLIDATION

On Motion of Mr. E. Stanhope, consolidate certain enactments relating to acquisition of Land for Military Purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. E. S. and Mr. Brodrick.

Bill presented, and read first time. [F

#### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS

That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act to amend 'The Indian Councils Act, 1861.'" [Indian Councils (1861) Amendment Bill [Lords].

#### ARMY ESTIMATES, 1892-3

Copy presented,—of Army Estimates of Effective and Non-Effective Strength for 1892-3, with Statement showing variations of the numbers of Majesty's British Forces, the amounts included for the Colonies and Egypt, the sums provided for each Army Service, and for various miscellaneous establishments [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and printed. [No. 76.]

#### RESIDENT MAGISTRATES (IRELAND)

Return ordered—

"Of the Resident Magistrates of Ireland, showing their names, ages when appointed, former vocation, districts where they exercise jurisdiction, salaries on appointment and at present, and the tenure on which they hold office; also distinguishing those—

- (1.) Of the sufficiency of whose knowledge the Lord Lieutenant expressed himself satisfied, within the meaning of section 11 of 'The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887'.
- (2.) Of the sufficiency of whose knowledge the Lord Lieutenant expressed himself satisfied, within the meaning of section 22 of 'The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887'.
- (3.) Of the sufficiency of whose knowledge and legal experience the Lord Chancellor has expressed himself satisfied, within the meaning of section 1 of 'The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887' (in the Session 1889)."—(Mr. John Elliott)

#### RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Ordered, That the Minutes of the Select Committee on Railway Servants (Hours of Labour), in Session 1889, be referred to the Select Committee on Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—(Sir Hicks-Beach.)

House adjourned at five o'clock after Twelve

HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 23rd February, 1892.*

ING AND LOANS (INFANTS)

BILL. [H.L.]—(No. 13.)

SECOND READING.

or of the Day for the Second Reading.

HERSCHELL: My Lords, in the Second Reading of this Bill, it is not necessary for me to detain your Lordships with any explanation of the provisions, or any arguments in support of the Bill, because there was a consensus in your Lordships' House when this Bill was introduced, that it was expedient that legislation of this nature should be undertaken with the view of preventing an evil which undoubtedly exists, which is growing, and has ended—as is well known—in the ruin of many. My Lords, the Bill passed your Lordships' House, and went to the other House, where it was read a second time and referred to a Committee; but, owing to the close of the Session, and the opposition with which it was met, it was impossible to pass it into law. My Lords, I am glad to think that the fact that opposition was a very real one indeed. I believe the consensus of opinion in favour of the Bill in the other House of Parliament was very nearly unanimous, and in accordance with the view taken by your Lordships in this House. But, my Lords, I think it is desirable—inasmuch as I have endeavoured to acquaint your Lordships with the reasons which influenced those who objected to the Bill—with those objections so far as they are able to gather them, and I believe I did gather them completely. My Lords, it was said, as one objection, that this Bill was a rich man's Bill. The statement rests on an entire misapprehension of fact. It is not a Bill to protect the rich any more than it can, in any sense, come under that designation. It is well known that this evil extends to, and affects, the poor as well as the rich, and that many of them are felt by, many of them in no sense be called rich;

and I am quite sure that, if those, who took that objection, had seen the letters that I received in relation to this Bill, they would have found that it excited interest in classes as far removed as possible from the description of the rich, who were as desirous of seeing it pass into law as any could be who were well endowed with this world's wealth. Therefore, I say, that is an objection founded on a misapprehension. I do not believe that, under this Bill, those who are rich, or have the prospect of riches, would, in nearly as many instances, be beneficially affected (if this Bill should be successful) as those whose means are very limited indeed. Then, my Lords, another objection was taken. It was said that the person inciting an infant to these transactions was alone made punishable, while no punishment was provided for the person who yielded to the incitement. My Lords, the whole foundation of legislation of this description relating to infants is that protection may well be afforded to them which you would not afford to those who do not come within that description. It is, my Lords, a fact, that is known to us all, that, although a person may have passed the years of childhood, yet, nevertheless, he has not arrived at a condition of well matured judgment, and he is likely to be easily tempted, by those who know the world infinitely better than he does, into an action which, if he possessed the judgment which he will possess a year or two later, he would be the first to see was unwise and ruinous. The whole basis of legislation is that you may properly extend protection to those, under a certain age, who need it, which it would not be possible to extend generally. My Lords, there are plenty of precedents for legislation of this description, but it is only necessary for me to refer to one. A person is subject to a criminal charge who induces a woman, under an age when she can no longer be called a child, and is, in every sense of the term, an adult, to leave her home and parents, or those under whose care and protection she is living; whilst no one has ever suggested that it followed, as a logical consequence, that you ought to make her responsible as well as the person who ab-

ducts her or induces her to leave her home. My Lords, I think that illustration is enough to show that no new step is taken in the legislation to which I am inviting your Lordships to give your assent. Another objection, my Lords, that was taken was that, under this measure, you compel the person charged to prove himself innocent. I do not think that is a just or adequate description of this legislation. The Bill does that which has been done very frequently—I could cite almost numberless instances—for many years past; it is to make certain facts *prima facie* evidence unless they are displaced; that is to say, when you know that certain facts will in general, in almost every case, or in the great majority of cases, indicate some inference, you should take that inference to be established, unless the person, within whose power it is to make the facts known, and who is in full possession of them, should show that the facts are otherwise. My Lords, I think not only is that not contrary to the spirit of English law, but it is in accordance with common sense, and is a principle that ought to be adopted. So far as I know, my Lords, with one exception, those are the only objections I have heard to this Bill; and, dealing with all those objections, I would say at once that I should be most pleased to consider any suggestions that might be made, by way of Amendments to the Bill, which would remove any difficulty which may be felt by any of those who have raised those objections. I do not feel bound, by any spirit of pedantry, to the exact provisions of the Bill; and, if, without defeating its object, any of those difficulties can be removed by suggestions from any quarter, no one will be more pleased than myself to alter its form in those respects. But, my Lords, if those who have objections to the Bill are unable to suggest any way in which it can be made safer or more advantageous, you are reduced to this question: whether, because there may be possible difficulties in some quite exceptional case, or some possible danger in such legislation, you ought to forego legislation which, on the whole, is felt to be necessary and beneficial, on account of some possible danger which nobody sees any

*Lord Herschell*

way of remedying or avoiding? seems to me, my Lords, that, if we were to act on such a principle as it would be practically to forego legislation; because you cannot any Act of a remedial character without carrying with it some possible dangerous consequences. I said, my Lords, that there was one other objection raised to the Bill. It has been that the Bill does not deal with an important matter of public interest it ought to deal with. I have no doubt your Lordships are aware that already under legislation that has existed a long time, a bet cannot be recovered at a Court of Law; but it has been notwithstanding those provisions of the Legislature, that, if you employ a person to make a bet for you, and payment is made by him, the amount of the bet can be recovered from the person who gave the directions to make it. I believe the Courts arrived at that conclusion somewhat reluctantly, but they were themselves bound to it by the terms of the enactment. Consequently, we have seen of late in a good many cases what I call the scandal of the time of Justice and juries occupied often for hours, I believe, in some cases for days, determining betting disputes which ought not to have come within the cognizance of a Court of Law at all. My Lords, I felt that it was possible to introduce that matter into the Bill which deals with infants, without changing the framework of the Bill which would be creating difficulties, but, so far as that subject is concerned, I trust that those who take that objection will feel that it will be removed when I tell your Lordships that I propose, in a short time, to present a Bill dealing with that matter by itself, and to ask you to give your assent to it.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read."  
—(*Lord Herschell*.)

\***LORD NORTON:** My Lords, may I be allowed in one word to express deep gratitude to the noble and learned Lord for again introducing this Bill, which, by an accident almost, failed at the last moment of last Session to pass the other House. I am sure your Lordships all agree in feeling grateful to him for having persisted with

most useful measure, which has been proposed for a long time to Parliament, for the general welfare of this country. Your Lordships not only agreed unanimously to its propositions when it was introduced at the beginning of last Session; but the only amendment which you made was to carry it out still further. The first proposition was merely to check betting agents from inciting youths to a system of betting in their young days which was sure to grow into a system utterly demoralising to them, and with consequences miserable to their families. Your Lordships brought within the provisions of the Bill the making of loans to an infant an invalid contract. That was a very considerable advance in the proposition, which was carried, without one word against it, in this House. When the Bill went before the Lower House there was, apparently, the same unanimity on all sides; there was not an appearance of any opposition to thus protecting infants from such demoralising influences. But at the last moment in the Session, when this measure and others had been thrust into a corner by more pressing business, it was possible for any one individual merely to put a notice on the Paper to be fatal to the Bill—and so it happened. I believe none wished to frustrate the Bill, and I believe that the idea in putting such notice of Amendment on the Paper was a simple fallacy as to the objections which the noble and learned Lord has just shown to be absolutely futile. My Lords, as to the being a Bill for the rich and not for the poor, anybody who makes that objection shows that he knows nothing whatever about the object and circumstances of this Bill. It is perfectly true that there may not be gambling on so large a scale now in this country as there was in the days of Fox, as we read; but—which is infinitely worse—the spirit of gambling permeating the whole of Society from high to low. There is not a house in which the servants are not exposed to his temptation; there is no tradesman, however small, who is not more or less engaged in it. And, my Lords, when once lads are trained and engaged in it, I do believe that, in general, all sense of honour ceases, and a lower

state of morality takes place in the minds of those engaged in its pursuit. It may be said that these betting agents, who number thousands in this kingdom, are dealing with young lads in a very small way—only a few shillings; and there are parents who are foolish enough to think that there is not much harm in that. They do not know the seeds of corruption that are being bred in young minds, to their demoralisation and ruin, and to the misery of their parents and families. There can hardly be, my Lords, I believe, a more important measure brought before this House, and I really do believe that there is no greater source of mischief in this country at this moment than the temptation of the young to begin life by indulging in this spirit of gambling. I really believe there is nothing that so much militates against all that we are doing in the way of the advance of education, and the amelioration of the morals of the country, and the reduction of crime, (in which we are so interested at this time) as this growing spirit of gambling. I know the noble and learned Lord will not lose a moment in pressing this Bill through this House, as there is a unanimous consent of your Lordships to assist him in carrying it as speedily as possible, in order that it may begin in the other House at an earlier time, which may prevent its being again stifled by some ignorant or senseless individual, who, by the mere fact of putting a notice upon the paper, can frustrate the progress of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

#### COUNTY COUNCIL CANDIDATES.

##### QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, the question that I desire to ask Her Majesty's Government relates to the point whether a Clerk to the Petty Sessions is disqualified from being a member of the County Council? The point turns upon certain sections in the Municipal Corporations Act, which is incorporated with the Local Government Act, and a section in the Local Government Act

itself, which I will read, as it is very short. The disqualifying section is to this effect :—

“A person shall be disqualified who has, directly or indirectly, by himself or his partner, any share or interest in any contract or employment with, by, or on behalf of the Council.”

My Lords, the clerk of the Petty Sessions is not appointed by the Council, but he is dependent upon the Council for his salary; because, by Section 84 of the Local Government Act, it is provided that the Joint Committee of the County Council should be substituted for Quarter Sessions as to all powers connected with the fixing of salaries or fees to be received by the clerk of Petty Sessions and the payment of such salaries. The question therefore arises whether, inasmuch as the Clerk to the Petty Sessions, if elected to the County Council, would be qualified to be a member of the Joint Committee as a member of the County Council, and might be appointed as such, he would not be so indirectly interested in this pecuniary question of the fixing of his salary that he would be disqualified? The point is not by any means an abstract one, for I understand that there are several candidates in different parts of the country who are clerks of Petty Sessions; and, if it is possible to clear up the doubt, it will be a great satisfaction to those who are interested in those elections. My own feeling is—while not attempting for a moment to say what is the right interpretation of the Act, which is a legal question—that it is desirable that such an officer should not be a member of the County Council, under all the circumstances.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I regret that the noble Lord who would properly respond for Her Majesty's Government is not in his place. Lord Henniker, I am sorry to say, is kept away by reason of suffering from the prevailing epidemic. I should be glad if he were here to answer the question for more reasons than one. In the first place, I think it is a very difficult question; and, in the next place, my noble Friend, who represents the Local Government Board in this House, would be able to answer it without the responsibility that attaches to a Judge who

may have hereafter to discuss that very question when it comes before him in his judicial capacity. But the point which is no doubt an important one and, as I have said, a very difficult one, seems to me to turn very much upon the nature of the relation between the County Council and the officers in question. Those officers were appointed under certain provisions, and fulfil certain functions which do not directly place them under the County Council—that is quite true. On the other hand, the language of disqualification is very peculiar. I did not catch whether the noble Lord read the language of disqualification from the Statute.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I did.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I see you put the language of disqualification in the Statute, and you see the relation that these officers bear to the County Council in respect of their remuneration and what they have to do, and ask whether they were to be under the County Council or not, that raises an extremely difficult question. I am giving an opinion on the subject I hope your Lordships will understand that I have not had the point argued before me, and therefore it is an opinion which I am entirely at liberty to retract when the question is properly argued before me; and I say that the more impressively because I understand that my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General has given an answer to-day to the very question in the House of Commons with which (I speak always under the reserve that I have mentioned) I should not entirely concur. The impression that I should form, upon the whole, would be that the object, and meaning and spirit of the Statute is that these officers should not be qualified as County Councillors—that the disqualifying section would apply to them. But, as I say, it is certainly not directly said; it is only said by reference, and reference in such a way as to make it extremely doubtful whether the words of disqualification apply to them in the character in which they would be members of the County Council. I am afraid, my Lords, that the proposition is not very clear as I put it; but that is not my fault; it is the fault of the Legislature in passing

*The Earl of Kimberley*

the Act in the form in which it was passed. The only thing I can say is that my own impression (and I do not give it as anything more) would be that they are disqualified, and that—inasmuch as they do receive their remuneration from the County Council, although that is not the word contained in the disqualifying section, yet, looking at the object, and purpose, and meaning of the Statute as a whole, considering what it was intended to prevent in the event of offices of that sort being held under a body who themselves had, in some sense, the control over them—the holders of those offices should not be members of that body. My impression, therefore, at present is that they are within the disqualifying section, and could not properly be elected to the County Council.

**CLERGY DISCIPLINE (IMMORALITY) BILL**  
[H.L.](No. 19.)

A Bill for better enforcing discipline in the case of crimes and other offences against morality committed by clergymen—Was presented by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; read 1<sup>st</sup>; and to be printed.

House adjourned at ten minutes  
before Five o'clock.

**HOUSE OF COMMONS,**

*Tuesday, 23rd February, 1892.*

**QUESTIONS.**

**THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD,  
IRELAND.**

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): On behalf of my hon. and learned Friend Mr. T. M. Healy (Longford, N.), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what has been done by the Congested Districts Board in any of the congested districts, and how often has it met since the passing of the Act; and if he can explain why, although the Act transferred from the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries and the Board of Works the money available for fishing loans under the Irish Reproductive

Loan and the Sea Coast Fisheries Funds to the Congested Districts Board, the two former bodies are still administering these funds in the name of the Congested Districts Board?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): Since the passing of the Act I am informed that the members of the Congested Districts Board have met on 45 occasions; nine times at Board meetings, and 36 times in committee meetings. Several schemes for the development of sea fisheries, and the improvement in the breed of horses, live stock, and poultry, involving an expenditure of about £8,400, have been approved, and are being carried out. The Board are also engaged in making local inquiries respecting the condition of the congested districts. The arrangements whereby the Irish Reproductive Loan and Sea Coast Fishery Funds have continued to be administered by the Inspectors of Fisheries and the Board of Works, on behalf of the Congested Districts Board, is merely a temporary one, pending the necessary legal arrangements connected with the transfer, which are now almost concluded.

MR. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, is it necessary that the Board should sit in private? There is great public interest taken in its proceedings; could not representatives of the Press be admitted, or, failing that, could a summary of the proceedings at each meeting be supplied to the Press?

MR. JACKSON: I should not like to answer that question without consideration. I think it will be obvious that if a decision is come to by the Board, or by a committee, to take certain action which may involve certain expenditure, it is not desirable to make that known until it is actually carried out. But I do not think there would be any objection to a communication being made by the secretary, possibly conveying information for publication, but I will mention the question.

MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say for what districts have the sums sanctioned been appropriated?

MR. JACKSON: I have no details; but, of course, as the hon. Member is

aware, the Board is divided into committees for dealing with certain proposals, and, of course, these proposals may apply to the whole of the districts.

#### REPORTED ATTEMPT TO WRECK A TRAIN.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Irish Government has been called to reports which appeared in public newspapers describing an alleged attempt to wreck a train by which the hon. Member for South Tyrone was travelling from Fintona to Omagh on the 27th inst; whether he is aware that the matter has since been investigated before a Petty Sessions Court, and information against the person accused (a child of eight years) refused by the Magistrates; and if the Sessional Crown Solicitor who appeared for the Railway Company is correctly reported as having said—

“That the Railway Company had investigated the matter very carefully, and had come to the conclusion the offence was not the result of a deliberate act, and that they were now fully satisfied that the first report was an erroneous one?”

MR. JACKSON: I understand the facts appear to be substantially as stated in the question.

#### THE KILKENNY COAL-FIELDS.

MR. M'DERMOT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the passages in the Report of the Royal Commission on Irish Public Works (1887) as to the necessity for a railway connecting Castlecomer and the Kilkenny coal-fields generally with the surrounding railways, and the public advantages likely to result from such a line; whether he is aware that the output of those coal-fields, though capable of indefinite expansion, is now limited to the production of purely local supplies, owing to the want of facilities for carriage; and whether, in view of the fact that the Board of Inland Navigation in the year 1801 offered to grant a sum of £40,000, out of moneys voted for the purpose by the Irish Parliament, to construct a canal intended to

develop these coal-fields, the Government will now grant a similar sum to induce the Great Southern and Western Railway to construct and work such a line of railway as that suggested?

MR. JACKSON: Yes; I have seen the passage in the Report referred to. I have no specific information on the subject-matter of the second paragraph of the question. With regard to the subject generally, I may say that seven years ago a scheme was proposed for a railway to connect Castlecomer with the Kilkenny coal-fields under the Tramways Act of 1883. This came before the Committee of the Privy Council, and it was decided that the evidence did not warrant a recommendation of the scheme, inasmuch as, though it might be useful to the collieries, it was really a matter for private enterprise, and its general importance was not such as to warrant the taxing of a whole barony, no money being available from Imperial sources for such a purpose.

#### SERGEANT MAJOR WEBSTER'S PENSION.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he could state why Battery Sergeant Major Webster, discharged on the 24th April, 1883, has only received a pension of 1s. 5½d. instead of 2s. 1½d.; and if he was not entitled to a pension calculated as follows: seven years' continuous service as sergeant, Class III., 1s. 9d.; promotion after 21 years, 3d.; four years over-time, 4d.; less five years' service under age, 2½d., giving a total of 2s. 1½d.?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Battery Sergeant Major Webster was not entitled to the rates of pension as stated in the question. He received all that could be awarded to him under the Warrant in force at the time he was pensioned; but there are peculiarities in his case, and I am prepared to give it further consideration.

#### PENSIONS FOR CRIMEAN AND INDIAN MUTINY SERVICES.

MR. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what number of applications have been made:

*Mr. Jackson*

for special pensions to aged and distressed soldiers who served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny Campaigns, what number of these special pensions have been granted, and what will be their aggregate annual amount; whether the conditions laid down by the Chelsea Hospital are found to exclude many urgent and deserving cases; and whether it is intended to relax them in any way?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: The total number of applications for special pensions to aged and distressed soldiers who served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns received has been about 600. The pensions granted have been 39, amounting to about £720 a year. The remainder were refused, for the reason that the men had not completed 14 years' service. This and other questions are now being considered in consultation with the Treasury.

MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the fairness of granting pensions, irrespective of length of service, to men who have served in the Crimea and elsewhere, and who have become permanently disabled in and by their service?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: It is not for me alone to consider that, but I shall be very glad to give it consideration, in connection with other matters.

MR. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to say when he will make a definite statement on this subject?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: I think I have made a very definite statement. As to a further statement on the matter undergoing consideration, that shall be made as soon as possible.

#### COUNTY COUNCIL STOCK AND ACCOUNTS.

MR. MACINNES (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when he proposes to prescribe regulations for the issue of county stock, in accordance with Section 70 of "The Local Government Act, 1888," and also to prescribe the form of accounts of the receipts and expenditure of County Councils, as provided for in section 71 of the same Act?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): Regulations as regards the issue of county stock in accordance with Section 70 of the Local Government Act, 1888, were issued in July 1891, and were confirmed by an Order in Council in September last. The Local Government Board have not yet prescribed forms of accounts for the receipt and expenditure of County Councils. At the time when the County Councils were constituted it was found that there was great diversity of practice as to the mode of keeping the accounts, but some greater approach to uniformity has been obtained through the suggestions of the District Auditors when engaged on their audits. As yet, however, the Board think that it is desirable that further experience should be obtained before prescribing one form of account for all the counties.

#### THE POSTMASTER AT HARLESDEN.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether Mr. Timothy Smith is the postmaster at Harlesden, in Middlesex; and, if not, upon what day he resigned his post; who is now the postmaster at Harlesden, and upon what day the appointment was made; whether he is aware that Mr. Smith still lives at the Harlesden post office, and is now a candidate for the Middlesex County Council, and that a large number of bills are pasted on the windows of the post office, which is Mr. Smith's property, calling upon the electors to "Vote for Timothy Smith," and generally in support of his candidature; and whether this is an infringement of the Regulations of the Post Office; and, if so, what course will be taken?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (SIR JAMES FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): The office at Harlesden is what is called a Receiving House or Sub-Post Office, kept by a tradesman under regulations. Mr. Smith resigned his appointment on the 3rd instant, with a view to becoming a candidate for the County Council; and his wife being recommended was appointed on the 12th and installed on the 22nd. There is no Post Office rule against a husband residing with his wife, although she is a sub-postmistress; but the exhibition of



election bills in the post office window was contrary to regulation, and has now been discontinued.

MR. COBB: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to make further inquiry; because, as I am credibly informed, the resignation of the postmaster was a mere colourable device to avoid disqualification as a candidate for the County Council, and the late postmaster does practically discharge the duties of the office in his wife's name?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I am not prepared to make inquiry into the truth of a general allegation, but I will inquire into any specific allegation the hon. Member desires inquiry made into. As I have said, there is no impropriety in a man resigning the appointment in favour of his wife, and there are many precedents for the course followed in this case.

#### NAVAL REPAIRS ON THE IRISH STATIONS.

MR. MORROGH (Cork Co., S.E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many of the Queen's ships, of all classes, stationed at Naval stations on the South and West Coasts of Ireland, have been refitted, overhauled, or repaired during the past five years; what was the nature of such overhauling or repairs; where were these repairs effected; and what was the cost, in each case, of such works?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Fourteen of Her Majesty's ships, including coastguard cruisers, have been stationed off the South and West Coasts of Ireland at various times during the period in question, on all of which, with two exceptions, certain expenditure has been incurred for repairs, &c. In nearly every case the amount so expended has been comparatively small, the exception being in the case of the *Shannon*. The details are somewhat minute, and it is hardly possible to compress them within the limits of a Parliamentary answer, but if the hon. Gentleman desires the full information, I will give him the whole Return; the names of the ships, the nature of the repairs, and where these

were done. The Return is as follows:—*Revenge*, £271, and *Triumph*, £617, Queenstown and Passage Docks Company, Haulbowline, and Devonport; *Shannon*, £10,580, Devonport and Portsmouth; *Banterer*, £1,473, Devonport, Sheerness, Haulbowline, and Queenstown and Passage Docks Company; *Britomart*, £648; *Orwell*, £190, and *Argus*, £2,358, Devonport, Haulbowline, and Queenstown and Passage Docks Company; *Shamrock*, £30, Queenstown and Passage Docks Company and Haulbowline; *Gipsy*, £9, Haulbowline; *Victoria*, £874, Devonport, Plymouth, and Dartmouth; *Stag*, £922, Londonderry, Devonport, Sheerness, Haulbowline, and Queenstown and Passage Docks Company; and *Fly*, £453, Devonport.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): But were any of the repairs carried out at Haulbowline?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Well, I think the hon. Member had better wait until he can see the Return. Some of the repairs were done at Haulbowline.

#### ROYAL SMALL ARMS FACTORY, ENFIELD.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an order for 30,000 Martini-Henry carbines has been given to the Henry Barrel Company; and whether the cost will be more than the cost of the last order executed at the Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: An order for Martini-Henry carbines, required by the Government of India, has been given to the Henry Barrel Company, at a price above the cost of those last produced at the Small Arms Factory. Apart from some mechanical difficulties in executing the order at Enfield, consequent on alterations in the machinery for the purposes of the Lee-Metford rifle, this course has been taken in fulfilment of my pledge that a fair share of production shall be given to the private trade of the country.

MR. J. ROWLANDS: Will the right hon. Gentleman state the difference in cost as between the Small Arms Factory and the Company?

*Sir James Fergusson*

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: My recollection is that the difference was as between 42s. and 60s.

**THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL RELATIONS (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND AND IRELAND).**

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will in the present Session give such early notice for striking the Committee on Financial Relations (England, Scotland, and Ireland), as will obviate its falling through in consequence of blocking Notices, as happened in the two last Sessions of Parliament?

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) had notice of the following question:—To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he intends this Session to ask the House to re-appoint the Select Committee on the Financial Relations between England, Scotland, and Ireland, which met towards the close of the Session before last?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EX-CHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): I am in communication with my right hon. Friend the Member for the St. Augustine's Division (Mr. Akers Douglas) with regard to this Committee, and I trust he will soon be able to put down a notice for the appointment of the Committee.

DR. CLARK (Caithness): Will the opportunity be given to discuss the question raised by Welsh Members and others?

MR. GOSCHEN: I must consult my right hon. Friend the First Lord; but I do hope that we shall be able to come to such an arrangement that hon. Members will abstain from blocking the Motion for the appointment of the Committee.

MR. SEXTON: Has the right hon. Gentleman made up his mind not to put the notice on the Paper to be taken at such a time when it could not be blocked?

MR. GOSCHEN: No; I have not made up my mind upon that, but I will confer with my right hon. Friend as to whether the Government have any time for the purpose when a blocking notice would have no effect.

**POLICE PROTECTION AT GLASHKINLEEN, COUNTY CORK.**

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what was the nature of the answer returned by His Excellency to the memorial signed by over 100 ratepayers asking for the removal of the police protection hut at Glashkinleen, Newmarket, County Cork, which was presented to him some months ago; and whether, in view of the facts referred to by the memorialists, namely, the peaceful state of the locality, and the heavy cost of the extra police upon the ratepayers (amounting to 3s. in the £1 upon the valuation), he will advise the removal of the police hut? MR. FLYNN had notice also of the following questions: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cost to the ratepayers of the district of the police stationed in the protection hut at Glashkinleen, Newmarket, County Cork; how many police are there stationed, and what is the nature of their duties; and on what parish or districts does the burden of this extra police tax fall? To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named Cornelius Murphy, of Glashkinleen, Newmarket, County Cork, who is still under police protection, has been frequently charged with firing off his revolver on the public road, and on some occasions at unoffending parties; what action has been taken by the police authorities in regard to him; and whether police protection will be continued to him?

MR. JACKSON: I will answer the three questions of the hon. Member together. The reply sent to the memorialists was to the effect that the police were required for the protection of a man named Murphy, and since then the constabulary report that continued police protection is necessary for the preservation of the peace of the district. The extra cost to the ratepayers is 1s. 11d.—not 3s.—in the £1, and the amount is £137 annually. The police, five in all, are employed in the special protection and in general police work, including patrol duty. Murphy appears to have been charged on three

occasions with firing revolver shots in the public road, but the Magistrates had no conclusive evidence that he fired at any person. My reply to the last paragraph in the last question is in the affirmative.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the vicinity of the hut, or in the near neighbourhood, there are three police barracks; and is he aware that this man, who claims and receives police protection at this enormous cost to the ratepayers, has been convicted of firing off a revolver in the public road, and his revolver has been taken from him; and will police protection still be afforded to him?

MR. JACKSON: Yes, Sir. I have given an answer to the question.

MR. FLYNN: I will call attention to this matter in Committee of Supply.

#### PENSION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS (IRELAND).

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, whether the revision of the pension scheme (for teachers) has been made in the past every five years?

MR. JACKSON: The Act establishing the National School Teachers' (Ireland) Pension Fund came into operation on 1st January, 1880. The first valuation was concluded in the middle of the year 1885, the revised rules resulting therefrom coming into operation from 1st January, 1886. The second valuation was made in 1891, and the results are now under the consideration of the Treasury.

#### CERTIFICATES FOR INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS (IRELAND).

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that children intending to compete in the intermediate examinations in Ireland are required to produce certificates of birth, and are obliged to pay 3s. 7d. each for such certificates to the Registrar; and whether, in view of the fact that many of the pupils belong to the poorer classes, the Government will undertake to reduce the sum so charged to a nominal amount, say 6d.,

*Mr. Jackson*

as is done under the English Elementary Education Act?

MR. JACKSON: I have received a Report from the Assistant Commissioners for Intermediate Education, to the effect that the charge for certificates is not regulated by the Board. The charge does appear to me to be rather a high one, and I will make further inquiries on the subject.

#### COLONISATION VOTE.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer in what form the Government propose to ask the House for a Vote for colonisation purposes, whether in the Scotch Estimates or by a Supplementary Vote, or otherwise; whether this will be done at an early date, and whether any decision has been arrived at by the Government or by the Colonisation Board as to what particular locality in the Colonial Empire it is proposed to colonise with the funds referred to; and whether the Government have taken any steps since the month of July last, or propose shortly to take any steps, to facilitate or hasten an agreement with the Government of British Columbia as to colonisation of Crofter families or others in that Colony, in accordance with the recommendations of the Colonisation Committee of last Session, or otherwise?

MR. GOSCHEN: An application from the Scotch Office for the insertion in the Estimates of a sum of £7,500 for colonisation purposes was received after the Civil Service Estimates were practically closed. It was therefore impossible to include this sum in the Estimates, but when the Scotch Estimates are reached, a Supplementary Estimate for this amount will be presented at the same time. It is proposed with these funds to take steps for the emigration of Scotch Crofter families to Canada. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's question, we made what I consider to be an extremely liberal offer to the Government of British Columbia, and are now awaiting their answer. I should be very sorry to take any steps which would imply that we are anxious to press colonists upon a country which is not cordially ready to receive them.

and I therefore consider that the next step should be taken by the British Columbia Government.

# INCOME TAX ASSESSMENTS, SCHEDULE D.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's) : I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that in the case of certain public commercial companies in London the Inland Revenue Commissioners have assessed under Schedule D, and have sought to charge Income Tax on the following items of expenditure incurred in the course of the business of the companies referred to, viz.: debenture stamps, telegrams, bank charges, travelling expenses, debenture commissions, advertising, printing, and stationery; whether he will explain on what principle all or any of such items come under Schedule D as liable for Income Tax; and in the event of his not being aware that such assessments for Income Tax as above described have been made, whether he will cause full inquiry into the subject to be made?

MR. GOSCHEN : The hon. Member made a very usual mistake in thinking that the Inland Revenue Commissioners are the assessing authorities in the cases to which he refers. The assessments are made by the Commissioners of Income Tax for the City of London, who are an independent body, and not under the control of the Government. With regard to the substance of his question, I have to point out that it is incorrect to say that Income Tax is charged upon certain items of expenditure. Income tax under Schedule D is, of course, charged upon profits, and the question which has arisen is whether certain items of expenditure may or may not be deducted from the annual gross profits for the purpose of ascertaining the profits upon which the assessment is made. The items of expenditure mentioned in the question were connected with the issue of debentures, but the Commissioners held that they were of the nature of capital expenditure, and therefore not properly to be deducted from the annual profits. If the assessment had been made in the usual way, an appeal against

it was heard by the City Commissioners of Income Tax, sitting judicially. It was open to a company dissenting from their decision to have a case stated, at a very trifling cost, for the decision of the High Court of Justice, and I understand that in some cases this step has been taken. The point is one for judicial decision, and not for administrative action.

# STATIONERY OFFICE WASTE PAPER DEPARTMENT.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.) : I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that a number of girls are employed in the waste paper department of the Stationery Office under unhealthy conditions and at low wages; and whether he is prepared to take steps to secure the amendment of the conditions of employment of the girls concerned?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham) : Yes; and I have visited the factory in company with Mr. Pigott, the Controller of the Stationery Office. The statements referred to seemed to me highly coloured, and the building and conditions of employment much better than represented. With reference to the statement that there was a violation of the Factory Act, I found that the Controller had already sent for an Inspector from the Home Office, whose Report, however, I have not yet received. But I understand the factory has been regularly inspected by the Factory Inspector of the district, and that all suggestions made by him from time to time have been at once carried out. The Controller will obtain a Report from experts as to the possibility of removing the dust by fans or otherwise; the question of revising the wages will be considered; and steps will be taken to improve, as far as practicable, the conditions of the employment.

MR. J. ROWLANDS : Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say the question of wages will be reconsidered?

SIR JOHN GORST : Yes; it will be considered at once.

**THE POLICE AND THE SALVATION ARMY AT EASTBOURNE.**

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Watch Committee of the Eastbourne Town Council, on 14th July, 1891, he received a request from the Committee for permission to withdraw police protection from the Salvation Army in the streets of that borough; and, if so, what was his reply; and whether he has any objection to laying the correspondence upon the Table?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): Yes; I received a letter from the Mayor of Eastbourne on 14th July, in which he stated that, owing to the action of the Salvation Army, the claims on the police force were becoming very heavy; that they were unfairly deprived of their Sunday rest, and that parts of the borough had to be left with inadequate police protection, and in which he inquired whether the Watch Committee would be justified in limiting the police protection in the parts of the town frequented by the Salvation Army to the usual protection afforded on ordinary occasions, notice of this being given to the Salvation Army. In answer to this letter, the Mayor was informed that the responsibility for maintaining the peace in Eastbourne rested with him, the Watch Committee, and the Magistrates, and that the Secretary of State could not sanction or recommend any measures which might have the effect of allowing disturbances to take place unchecked. I do not think any public purpose will be served by laying this correspondence on the Table, but I shall be happy to furnish the hon. Member with copies of these letters if he desire it.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the borough of Eastbourne the practice of boycotting all those persons who are known to be in sympathy with the Salvation Army is in full swing; and, under these circumstances, will the

Government consider whether it is desirable to apply to that borough certain provisions of the Irish Coercion Act?

MR. MATTHEWS: No case of boycotting has been reported to me.

**RAILWAY RATES PROVISIONAL ORDERS.**

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is intended to refer the Railway Rates Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, introduced into Parliament on the 10th instant, to a similar Committee to that to which similar Bills were referred last Session; and whether, considering that some of the Bills cannot yet be procured by the public, and the difficulty which may be experienced by traders and agriculturists in complying with the ordinary rule requiring Petitions against Bills of this kind to be deposited within seven days after the Examiner's notice has been given, a relaxation of this rule will be conceded similar to that adopted in respect of the Bills of last Session, allowing all persons to be heard whose Petitions are deposited before the sitting of the Committee to which the Bills may be referred?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir; I intend, in respect of such of the Railway Rates Provisional Orders Confirmation Bills as may be opposed, to ask the House to follow the precedent of last year. As all the Bills are now in the hands of Members, I trust that, should the necessary resolutions be carried, the Committee may meet at an early date.

**SENTENCE ON BEDWELL FOR ESPIONAGE.**

MR. BALLANTINE (Coventry): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office has made any attempt to obtain a remission of a sentence of imprisonment and fine passed by the Police Court of St. Etienne, on 26th December last, upon an English subject named Bedwell, as accessory to an offence against the French law of espionage, alleged to have been com-

mitted by an English subject named Cooper; and whether the British Ambassador in Paris has instructions to render any assistance to British subjects arrested under the French law of espionage, or to make representations to the French authorities upon their behalf?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Unofficial representations have been made to the French Government with a view to the mitigation of the sentence passed on Bedwell. Her Majesty's Ambassador is always ready to assist British subjects, but it is impossible for him to interfere with the ordinary course of justice in France.

#### THE NEW ADMIRALTY BUILDINGS.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works why the proposed buildings at the Admiralty have not yet been commenced?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET, Dublin University): The foundations of the new Admiralty buildings were completed last spring. The invitations for tenders for the superstructure were considerably delayed owing to the strike which prevailed in the Metropolis from May until November last. During this strike it would have been most unwise for the Government to have invited tenders, as contractors would have been compelled to send in high estimates in order to provide against possible loss arising from the uncertain issue of the strike. On its termination, advertisements for tenders for the first block were published immediately, all necessary preparations having long before been made. As a result, a contract with Messrs. Shillitoe and Sons was agreed to; and after an interval, no longer than was absolutely needed for the adjustment of the details of the contract, orders to commence work were given—that was a week ago—and operations are now in progress.

#### THE ROYAL NAVAL ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS.

DR. CAMERON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an arrangement has been come to be-

tween the Admiralty and the War Office, under which the latter is to take over the responsibility for the coast defence of this country; and, if so, is it proposed to employ the officers and men of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, in the event of them transferring their services to the War Office, in manning gunboats, torpedo, and patrol boats for the defence of the ports and the mine fields connected with them; and, if not, whether he would state how it is proposed to employ the force in the event of its agreeing to the transfer?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: No such arrangement has been made, as the War Office has always been responsible for coast defence. The employment of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, or of some of them, is still under consideration; but I have indicated to them that congenial employment might be found for them in the corps of Submarine Mining Engineers at certain ports.

DR. CAMERON: As to the question of responsibility, the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to explain that in framing the question my only desire was that the men should know what sort of employment it was proposed they should be engaged in.

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: Quite so. That has been clearly indicated to them.

#### MINES AND FACTORIES IN THE ISLE OF MAN.

DR. CAMERON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can explain why the Factory and Workshops Act is not administered in the Isle of Man, where large numbers of women and young persons are employed; and if there is any distinction drawn between the Coal Mines and Metalliferous Mines Acts and the Factory and Workshops Act in respect to their application to the Isle of Man; and, if so, why?

MR. MATTHEWS: Parliament has not thought fit to make the Factory and Workshops Act, 1878 and 1891, applicable to the Isle of Man. The Metalliferous Mines Act, 1872, does by express reference extend to the Isle of Man; the Coal Mines Regulation Act,

1887, does not—for this reason, possibly, that there is no coal in the district.

#### RECEIVERSHIPS UNDER THE LAND JUDGES.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if he can say on what date the Land Judges received the application of Captain O'Connor, of the Palace Elphin, to be appointed to the Receivership under the Land Judges; what was the date of the appointment and that of the withdrawal, if any; and what might be the net annual value of the appointment?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. MADDEN, Dublin University): I have already stated, the gentleman mentioned in the question did not receive any appointment. He was placed on a list as being eligible for appointment, which is quite a different matter.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON RECRUITING.

SIR W. BARTTELOT (Sussex, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the Report of Lord Wantage's Committee on Recruiting will be laid upon the Table of the House; and when he will be able to inform the House whether he can lay the whole of the evidence also upon the Table?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I have already presented this Report, and it will be circulated on Thursday, but I hope a few advance copies will be in the House to-morrow morning. I saw there was an absurd suggestion in a morning paper yesterday that I wanted to keep back this Report. I have not kept it back a single day, and the delay was caused by the calculation, for the purpose of one of the dissenting members of the Committee, of the cost of their recommendation. I have not yet received the evidence; but when I do, I shall decide about presenting it, and in all probability I shall do so at once.

#### CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many of the ten gentlemen

who may act as members of the Congested Districts Board, recently set up in Ireland, are Protestants, and how many are Catholics; is the secretary of the Board a Protestant or a Catholic; and will he explain on what principle Catholics have been denied a larger representation on this Board, seeing that they have constantly complained of not being sufficiently represented on Boards nominated by Government?

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Before the Chief Secretary answers that question, I wish him to say whether it is a fact that all the members of the Congested Districts Board are Unionists, and that the holding of Nationalist opinions is a disqualification?

MR. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will discourage as much as possible the attempt of hon. Members opposite to raise questions calculated to create religious animosity in Ireland?

MR. JACKSON: This question only appeared on the Paper this morning, and, therefore, my only means of communication were by telegraph. The answer I have got is that there is no official record of the religious persuasion of the members of the Board.

MR. MAC NEILL: I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman as an English gentleman, is he aware of the religion of those gentlemen? Does he know, of his own knowledge, that there are eight Protestants and only two Catholics on this Board?

MR. JACKSON: I think the hon. Gentleman will see that it is quite impossible for me to have any definite knowledge on the subject.

MR. MAC NEILL: I will repeat the question to-morrow.

#### THE CIVIL SERVICES OF INDIA.

MR. MAC NEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that there were, on March 31st, 1886, 3,573 Europeans, including Eurasians, and only 492 Indians, drawing Rs5,000 and upwards in the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Civil Services of India; and if he can state why Europeans, including Eurasians, are in the proportion of seven to one to Indians in those Services?

*Mr. Matthews*

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA** (Mr. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): Yes, Sir. The figures are those which I gave the House on Friday at the hon. Member's request. The proportion of Eurasians and Europeans to Natives of India in the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services, taken as a whole, is not seven to one. The reason why the majority of the higher appointments in those Services is held by Europeans is explained in the Report of the Public Service Commission.

**Mr. MAC NEILL:** Is not the proportion in the two Services as eleven Europeans to one Indian? Is that true or false?

**Mr. CURZON:** I think I cannot do better than to commend to the hon. Member a more careful study of the Report than he appears yet to have bestowed upon it.

**Mr. MAC NEILL:** May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether this practice of excluding Natives from the government of their own country was not denounced by Lord Lytton when he said that we had cheated the Natives?

#### **THE MAYORALTY OF BELFAST.**

**Mr. O'KEEFFE** (Limerick): May I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if, having regard to his intention of raising the Mayoralty of Belfast to that of a Lord Mayoralty, he will, in appreciation of concurrent rights of other Irish Municipalities, restore to the Mayors of Limerick, Cork, and Waterford the privilege of which they have been lately deprived, of being nominated Commissioners for holding the Assizes in Ireland?

**Mr. JACKSON:** In reply to a question put by the Member for Waterford in 1888, it was stated that the custom of nominating Mayors as Commissioners for holding the Assizes in Ireland had long since become practically useless, and had been accordingly abandoned. I am not aware of any reason for restoring the privilege of the Mayors referred to.

#### **IRISH DRAINAGE ACTS.**

**Mr. M. HEALY** (Cork): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether the Government propose to introduce a measure to amend the

Irish Drainage Acts this Session; and whether, if not, they intend to assent to the Bill of last year when re-introduced?

**Mr. MADDEN:** Yes, Sir; such a measure is in course of preparation, and I hope I shall be able very shortly to introduce it.

#### **THE COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS.**

**Mr. MANFIELD** (Northampton): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether salaried Clerks of Petty Sessional Divisions, in receipt of salaries from the County Council, are eligible as candidates for the County Council of the county in which their Petty Sessional Division is situate?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Sir R. WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): The question involves legal consideration of some difficulty; but, on the whole, I am of opinion that salaried Clerks of Petty Sessional Divisions are eligible as candidates for the County Councils.

**Mr. MANFIELD:** Is the hon. and learned Gentleman aware that, under the Municipal Corporations Act, Chap. 50, Section 12, Sub-section 3 any person is disqualified if he is directly or indirectly interested in any contract that may be made on behalf of the Council?

**SIR RICHARD WEBSTER:** I am perfectly aware of the provisions of that Statute, and therefore I expressed the opinion that there were legal difficulties involved in the case. I have given the hon. Member as much information as I can.

#### **IRISH POOR LAW UNIONS.**

**Mr. MAHONY** (Meath, N.): I beg to move for a Return showing, as regards each Poor Law Union in Ireland, the number of persons of each sex of 65 years of age and upwards, and the number under 65 years of age who have attained the age of 16 years of age, and the number of children under 16 years of age, in receipt from Boards of Guardians of indoor relief or outdoor relief respectively, during the twelve months ended at Lady Day, 1892.

**Mr. JACKSON:** Since the hon. Member was informed that there was no objection to the granting of this Return as an unopposed Return, I have



learned that a somewhat similar Return, though worded rather differently, is being prepared by the Local Government Board for England, giving the same information; and I beg to suggest to the hon. Member that he should postpone his Motion for a day or two, so that we may have two Returns framed on uniform lines for England and Ireland. The result will be more satisfactory.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR W. HARCOURT (Derby): Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us what will be the business to be fixed for Thursday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Well, Sir, I had hoped, as the House knows, that we might have succeeded in introducing the three Bills which stood on the Paper yesterday; but we have not succeeded in getting the First Reading for more than one of them. I propose, therefore, to put the other two Bills down for Thursday. The first Order of the Day will be the Bill which stands in the name of my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate, who will introduce a Bill for the distribution of the Scotch Equivalent Grant. The second Order of the Day will be the introduction of the Bill for dealing with Private Bill Procedure; and the third Order of the Day will enable us to complete the unfinished discussion upon the Bill brought forward yesterday by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary on Irish Education.

MR. S. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Will the Supplementary Estimates or the Indian Councils Bill be taken on Monday?

MR. BALFOUR: The Supplementary Estimates will be put down for Thursday, after the Bills to which I have alluded, and if they are not reached they will be taken on Monday.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): With reference to the Supplementary Estimates, I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman as to a sum of £30,000 for relief operations in Ireland last year, whether any information will be laid

before the House as to those operations, before we are called upon to vote the money?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes; I will take care that full statistics of those relief operations, bringing the account down to the time of their completion, shall be in the hands of hon. Members before they are asked to discuss the Vote.

MR. MAC NEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us whether the Indian Councils Bill is definitely fixed for Monday?

MR. BALFOUR: No, Sir; I think that, under present circumstances, probably we cannot take the Supplementary Estimates on Friday, and shall probably take them on Monday.

#### ATTENDANCE OF MR. DE COBAIN.

Order [Thursday 11th February 1892], That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley de Cobain do attend this House in his place upon Tuesday the 23rd of February, read; but Mr. De Cobain did not attend in his place pursuant to the said Order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg, Sir, to give notice that on Friday next I will move—(Cries of "Call him, call him.")

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain do attend this House in his place upon Tuesday, 23rd February. As many as are of that opinion say "Aye," the contrary "No." The "Ayes" have it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to give notice that on Thursday next I shall move that Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain having failed to obey the Order of the House—(Cries of "Perhaps he is here").

MR. DILLON: Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of order. I beg to say we have no evidence before us that Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain has failed to obey the Order of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Gentlemen must be aware that if Mr. De Cobain had been here he would have been in his place, having been ordered to be in attendance this day; but I will call him—Mr. De Cobain. His not appearing shows that he has not complied with the Order of the House.

*Mr. Jackson*

MR. A. J. BALFOUR again rose and said: I have to give notice, Sir, that I shall on Friday next move that Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain, having failed to obey the Order of this House, that he should attend in his place on Tuesday, the 23rd February, and having fled from justice, be expelled this House.

### MOTION.

#### THE CHURCH IN WALES.

##### RESOLUTION.

\*(4.15.) MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I rise to move the Resolution which stands in my name, and which reads as follows:—

"That, as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people, and ministers only to a small minority of the population, its continuance as an Established Church in the Principality is an anomaly and an injustice which ought no longer to exist."

I cast myself on the indulgence of the House, as I have just risen from a sick bed to perform my duty here. I approach the subject with a deep feeling of responsibility, for I know how difficult it is to do full justice to the intense convictions of the Welsh people on this burning question. In all the Debates we have had in this House I have always felt that we failed to give adequate expression to the deep sense of wrong that pervades the Welsh people. What Home Rule is to Ireland to-day, what Free Trade was to England 50 years ago, what "the disruption" was to Scotland 50 years ago, so is this question of religious equality to Wales to-day. It is the all-engrossing question, which agitates every household and practically divides the country into two camps, and there can be no peace or social harmony till this irritant is removed. Our difficulty is to convey to the English mind the grounds for this vehement controversy, and it imposes on us the painful duty of explaining why the English Church in Wales has wholly forfeited the respect of the mass of the people, and thrown them into the camp of Nonconformity. Deep changes in the religious convictions of a nation never occur except on adequate causes; all history shows

that there is nothing so difficult to effect as a change of religion, and Wales is no exception to that rule. The revolt of the people from the Established Church was the result of intolerable wrongs. It was caused by the corrupt, oppressive, and anti-national character of the State Church, spread over centuries. I question if any ecclesiastical establishment presented more abuses than did that of Wales from the time of the Reformation down to the beginning of this century. It was used as an engine for crushing out the national spirit of the country, just as the sister Church of Ireland was, and with the same result. Its preferments were given in the most scandalous manner to English ecclesiastics for political services, and most of the rich livings of Wales were held for centuries by absentees, who deputed miserable and half-starved curates to do their duty. In many of the Welsh churches the language of the people was never spoken, in many of them services were only held once a year, and the lives of the clergy were often notoriously irreligious. Let me quote the language of that true patriot, Henry Richard, whose name will ever be held in reverence in Wales—

"Simony, nepotism, non-residence, pluralism, every form of ecclesiastical abuse ran riot in the Welsh Church. The great body of the clergy were ignorant, irreligious, immoral, in every way utterly incompetent to fulfil the duties of their office. And, indeed, many of them did not even attempt to fulfil their primary duty as instructors of the people."

I will trouble the House with one more quotation from the Rev. H. W. Clarke's excellent *History of Tithes*:—

"The majority of the Bishops, cathedral dignitaries, and parochial clergy did not know one word of the language of the people. They were aliens in blood, in manners, and in language from the great bulk of the people. The rites of confirmation, marriage, prayer, and preaching, were performed in the English language and then translated immediately into Welsh by an interpreter at the Bishop's or clergyman's elbow. Many of them resided in England or on the Continent, spending the tithes or other revenues, and neglecting their spiritual duties."

It is argued by some that those abuses are matters of ancient history, and that it is needless to rake them up now, as they have long been cured. This is far from being the case; they were

shamefully prevalent in the first half of this century. One of the worst cases of nepotism that ever disgraced a Church was that of Bishop Luxmore, of St. Asaph, as lately as 1830. Mr. Johnnes, in his essay on the causes of dissent in Wales, states that Bishop Luxmore's income was £12,000 a year, and that he had bestowed livings on his sons and other relatives to the value of £15,000 a year. One of these sons was Dean of St. Asaph, Chancellor of St. David's, sinecure Rector of five livings, and the holder of several other preferments worth altogether £8,000 a year. It was computed that the Luxmore family drew more than all the working clergy of the diocese put together. And now, forsooth, we are told that these avaricious clergy possessed the true apostolical succession, and that it was a deadly sin for pious Nonconformists to leave their ministrations! I will now ask the House, for one moment, to consider the rise of Welsh Nonconformity. About the middle of last century the state of religion in Wales was at the lowest ebb. The Rev. Rees Pritchard of Llandoverly, a well-known clergyman, writes of the first half of the 18th century:—

"Licentiousness, drunkenness, dishonesty, falsehood, and infidelity are rampant through the Principality. Judges and juries sympathise with drunken murderers, and permit extortioners to rob widows and orphans. Sheriffs and their deputies plunder innocent people by virtue of their office. The Lord's Day is a day for drunkenness, dancing, idleness, games, and wanton lewdness among the Welsh."

It was the same in England before the revival of Wesley and Whitfield; in truth, the middle of last century marked the nadir of religious life in the United Kingdom. But there rose up in Wales at that time a band of the greatest preachers that perhaps the world has known. Some of them were clergy of the Established Church; but, as soon as they began to evangelise, they were expelled from her pale, and the whole force of the Church was used to stop their mouths and limit their holy work. The Methodists of Wales had to undergo even worse persecution than their brethren in England; mobs were hounded on against them, often by the recreant clergy, and, to use the language of Dr. Rees—

*Mr. Samuel Smith*

"The inoffensive worshippers were abused, most mercilessly pelted with stones, wounded with knives, shot at; men, and even women, stripped naked in the presence of the crowd; able-bodied men were pressed for the Army and Navy, and driven away from their friends and families like cattle."

If ever there were true successors of the Apostles it was men like Wesley and Whitfield in England, or Howell Harris and Daniel Rowlands in Wales—men whose whole lives were one continuous martyrdom for their Divine Master, and yet these men are now described in some Church Catechisms as heretics and schismatics, and their worship as a species of idolatry. In spite of cruel persecution; in spite of merciless evictions of multitudes of poor farmers because they became Dissenters; in spite of pressure of every kind brought by the Tory squirearchy, as well as the clergy, the great mass of the people became Nonconformists; the meaning of which is, that the great mass of the people became earnestly religious, and now for many years Wales has become a nation of Protestant Nonconformists; and I assert that Wales has reason to be proud of what Nonconformity has done. It has made the Principality of Wales the most religious portion of the United Kingdom; in no part of the Kingdom is attendance at public worship so universal; in none is the Sunday school so developed, including, as it does, a great part of the adult population as well as the children. In no part of the country is there so little crime; in none are the Judges so often presented with white gloves for maiden assizes; in none is the population so orderly, peaceable, and well-conducted. If I were asked to point to any spot in the world where Christianity had shown its most signal influence to civilise and elevate a people, I should point to Wales. The Nonconformists have covered Wales with 4,000 chapels out of their poverty, and they voluntarily raise £400,000 a year for religious purposes. Need you wonder, Mr. Speaker, that with such an experience the Welsh Nonconformists repudiate the theory that religion needs the support of State patronage and control? Their experience proves the contrary; it proves that religion in its purest and most spiritual form is far more active and efficacious when

freed from the benumbing effect of State patronage and State control, and left to the voluntary efforts of believers. The mass of the Welsh people have reached that stage of conviction which all English-speaking people, outside this island, have already attained, that all which religion requires from the State is a free hand and no favour. They are convinced that the whole machinery of the Established Church of this country is Erastian, and contrary to the principles of the New Testament. They can find no warrant there for Bishops appointed by the Prime Minister of the day, who may be a man of any religion or no religion, who may, for all we know, be a future Mr. Bradlaugh; they find no warrant for the Royal supremacy over the Church, for control of worship and doctrine by Act of Parliament; they find no warrant there for compulsory tithe, for the sale of advowsons, or for lay patronage. They believe that all these practices are grievous corruptions of primitive Christianity; and I think they are right, and the time is not far distant when the English people will think so. But it is urged by our opponents that a great improvement has taken place in the Welsh Church in recent years. The scandalous abuses have disappeared, and many of the clergy are now earnest and devoted men. I readily grant this is the case. Nothing can exceed the zeal and devotion of some of the clergy, but there are many exceptions yet to this rule. I do not contest, however, the improvement that has set in; but I must be allowed to call the attention of the House to the fact that the new life that is now flowing in the Church of England is actually widening the gulf between them and the Nonconformists; the dominant party is now the High Church party; its doctrines and ritual are in diametrical opposition to the views of all Protestant Nonconformists. The fact is the gulf between the Church of England and all Nonconformists was never so deep as it is now. Let me illustrate this by stating what recently happened at Llandudno. Two well known lady teachers were expelled from the Church Sunday school by the Rector because they declined to teach

a Catechism containing the following questions:—

“Why is it necessary to believe in one Holy Catholic Church?” Answer. “Because it is God’s one appointed way of salvation.” Question. “Does it then make any difference what church or sect we belong to?” Answer. “Yes, it makes a great difference whether we obey Christ or disobey Him.”

I may add that this manual of doctrine may be judged from the fact that the junior grade section recommended prayer for the dead, and the advanced grade, the Confessional. Now, if there is anything the Welsh Nonconformists may fairly claim, it is that their doctrines and Church policy are drawn pure and undefiled from the New Testament. They reject mediæval tradition, and refuse to admit any practices that are not authorised by express warrant of Holy Writ. The House will therefore understand how acute the difference has now become, and how intolerable they feel that it is that the revenues of their country should be applied to teaching doctrines so hateful to the great majority of the people. I have not so far dealt with the question of statistics as to the relative strength of Church and Dissent in Wales. The House has been wearied with piles of figures on previous occasions, and I can add nothing to what has been so well said from these Benches in the two recent Debates. I allow that all statistics that can be collected in Wales and quoted by one side are always disputed by the other. I am content to rest the case on the undoubted fact that the great majority of the Welsh people do not belong to the Church of England. What the majority is I do not explicitly assert, but I think few Church people will find fault with me if I state that the Church cannot claim more than one-fourth of the people of Wales. Some of my friends will think that I concede too much in saying this, and will only agree to one-fifth. But when you remember that this includes a large portion of English people resident in the large towns, you will see that it allows but a small fraction of the Welsh people to belong to the English Church. My own strong impression is, if we limit our survey to the

indigenous Welsh-speaking population, the proportion belonging to the Church would not be more than one-eighth. There are many rural churches in Wales, as everyone knows, where the congregation is hardly more than the minister's family and servants, and I have heard of cases where the usual attendance was six, eight, or ten persons. But I am going to ask the House to look at some other figures collected outside Wales, where there can be no partisan character about the census, and which bring out the real tendencies of the Welsh people. It is well known that a large Welsh population resides in Liverpool. It is a common saying that Liverpool is the capital of Wales, because containing a larger body of Welsh citizens than any other city in the country. It so happens, fortunately for this Debate, that a very painstaking census of attendance at all places of worship was taken towards the end of last year in Liverpool by one of our leading journals. It had no motive to serve but to get at all the actual facts. Now, I am going to give the House the result of the attendance at the Welsh-speaking services. There are but two churches where the Welsh language is used, but there are 28 Nonconformist chapels. The attendance at church in the morning was 165 persons, at the various chapels 4,832; in the evening the figures were, Church 330, Nonconformists 6,271. Reduce this to a percentage, the proportion is 3·3 per cent. for church in the morning, and 96·7 per cent. for chapels; in the evening it is 5 per cent. church, and 95 per cent. chapels. That is, on the best, showing 20 times as many Welsh-speaking people worship in chapels as in churches. A pretty good proof what an exotic the Church of England is. But I have an even more startling statement to make. It is well known that there is a large Welsh emigration to the United States. Wherever they go the Welsh people carry with them their intense religious feelings, and I am informed by a friend who has visited the United States and made careful inquiry that no less than 456 chapels exist where the Welsh language is preached, but not one Episcopal church. There was an attempt to

establish one but it failed, and the building was sold to the Congregationalists. If this statement does not convince the House as to the real drift of the Welsh people in matters of religion I despair of enlightening it. All churches are free and equal in America; none are bolstered up by State support, and I hold that America presents a far better test than Wales, where a State-endowed Church, having all the social influence on its side and bringing pressure to bear on the neediest and more helpless part of the community, can collect, it may be, a quarter of the population as nominal adherents. I think more need not be said to prove how overwhelming is the case we lay before the House. Every argument that justified the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church in Ireland holds equally good in Wales. The cases run almost on all fours. In each case you have a wealthy minority holding all the Church endowments, while the mass of the labouring class have to supply their own spiritual needs out of their poverty. In each case the Church endeavoured to proselytise and Anglicise the nation. In each case it utterly failed. In each case its history was marked by intolerable abuses persisted in till Parliament forced reform on a reluctant clergy. In each case the effect has been to deepen and intensify the persecuted faith, and strengthen the nationality it was intended to destroy. Every argument that justifies free government justifies the disestablishment of these two Churches; and the case of Ireland ought to reassure the most timid churchman. No one will deny that Disestablishment has improved the Church of Ireland. The springs of voluntary effort have been opened; and the laity have got their rightful position in the management of the Church. The same thing will happen in Wales. The strife that poisons Welsh life will be removed; the church will cease to lean upon carnal weapons; it will regain liberty and independence, and may have a career in the future far more creditable than it has had in the past.

(4.50.) MR. DILLWYN (Swansea, Town): I have much pleasure in seconding the Resolution so ably moved by my

*Mr. Samuel Smith*

Mr. Friend the Member for Flintshire. I do not desire to say much, as we have had the question discussed many times. Formerly the Established Church had a vantage ground in Wales, but they lost it go the chance they had, of proselytising the Welsh people, and by agreeing they forfeited their position. The Church was established by law, and it practically disestablished itself. By venality, corruption, and idleness it forfeited that position. When I first had the honour of bringing the question forward we received very little support for our object; we were a small minority without support, even from our own friends. Now, however, the question has been discussed again and again, and a change has come over the spirit of our dream. Instead of its being viewed with indifference, the Welsh people have taken it up with the warmest zeal; and even our own Leader has now conceded the position that if the Welsh people are really in favour of the Disestablishment, which we plead for, he is bound to support that demand. The Established Church endeavours to take up a position which I must comment on. The Welsh, who are an eminently religious people, finding themselves deserted and betrayed by the Church, were not content to remain in it; they provided themselves with religious houses and ministers. They have established a church for themselves, and they intend to remain in it; that is a point to which I wish specially to call attention. The Welsh clergy were immoral and dissolute, but now, I am willing to agree, many are very moral, excellent, and hard-working men; but the Welsh people have established a religion for themselves in place of one which betrayed their interests. It is, however, a common argument used by the Welsh clergy that the people really are not keen on this question; that they are desirous of going back to the Establishment. I am astonished at any ecclesiastic with any honesty whose nature should make such a statement. We know Wales pretty well, and we know that if she were left to herself she would be purely Nonconformist. Though great territorial influence has been brought to bear on any of the people, they have de-

clined to become churchmen. It is always difficult to find what the religion of a people is, and I have always opposed a religious census, on the ground that it would lead to the bringing to bear of a great territorial pressure on those who did not belong to the Established Church. Very soon we shall have a dissolution, and then you may be quite sure the Welsh people will declare themselves in favour of this Motion. But whether they declare themselves in favour of it or not, let a poll be taken, and I have no doubt that the result will be in favour of freedom of religion and the support of that Church which they have so well established for themselves in Wales.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people, and ministers only to a small minority of the population, its continuance as an Established Church in the Principality is an anomaly and an injustice which ought no longer to exist."—(Mr. Samuel Smith.)

\*(5.0.) THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir E. CLARKE, Plymouth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and on the part of those who sit upon this side of the House, a most definite and uncompromising opposition to the Resolution which has been moved and the policy which prompts that Resolution. Sir, I draw a distinction, and I think it is a natural one, between the Resolution and the policy which it is supposed to represent; for I am sure it will have been observed by those who have listened to the speeches of the Mover and Seconder of the Resolution that they have paid no attention to the terms of the Resolution at all; that they have made no attempt to establish any one of the propositions which it contains, and that they have contented themselves by referring to other matters—matters which I own might form matter for consideration in Debate, but are not relevant to the propositions put before the House. I am not surprised at the course they have taken. I was, in truth, somewhat amused to find that having long delayed in choosing the terms of the Resolution, the hon. Member for Flintshire on Friday last put upon the Paper of the

House this old Resolution, which has been proposed and debated several times, and which I thought had been absolutely destroyed last year by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. I saw in the paper to-day an inspired communication to a newspaper in which the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire writes that—

"Mr. Gladstone desired to support the Motion for Welsh Disestablishment this Session as he had done last Session."

Sir, I wish he were here to-day to do it. I can conceive nothing more satisfactory than that a Resolution aimed at the Church in Wales should be supported as the Resolution of last year was supported by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. We have taken care to circulate largely the speech of the right hon. Gentleman upon that occasion, and it will long be remembered as a lasting demonstration of the futility—I was going to use a stronger word—of the propositions in the Resolution before the House. Does anyone who heard him forget the paternal way in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian corrected the innocent indifference of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil to all the history of the Welsh Church? Does anyone forget the way in which he, taking the terms of this Resolution, declared that he could not agree with them, and stated with regard to the first phrase which strikes one's attention, that "the Church of England in Wales" was an entire misrepresentation, and that it would be as reasonable to speak of "the Church of Wales in England" as of "the Church of England in Wales?" Last year the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was a very interesting speech. He came down to the House in order to appear to make a recantation of his statement of 21 years ago, that it was impossible to dis sever the Welsh Church from the Church of England, and the principal sentence in which that apparent recantation was expressed deserves to be always remembered as the choicest possible example of the Parliamentary dexterity of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. I think no such gem was ever contributed to the records of

*Sir E. Clarke*

this House as the sentence in which he dealt with his statement of 21 years ago, that it is impossible to dis sever the case of the Welsh Church and the Church of England. I beg the House to mark the sentence. He said—

"It is quite possible that I may have used that expression which may, when strictly regarded, be found to involve the element of exaggeration."

The most the right hon. Gentleman could do when he came down to recant the declaration of 21 years ago, was, not to say that it was an exaggeration, but to say that he "might have used an expression" which "might, when strictly regarded, be found" not to carry with it, but "to involve," not exaggeration, but "the element of exaggeration." And, Sir, when the right hon. Gentleman had done his part in that apparent recantation, the House will remember how the right hon. Gentleman turned with obvious satisfaction to that which was more congenial by far; to speak out his mind, and particularly to declare that—

"The Established Church in Wales is an advancing Church, an active Church, a living Church, and I hope very distinctly a living Church rising from elevation to elevation."

It is not we who are slow to recall that speech of last year of the right hon. Gentleman. That speech contained another remarkable sentence, another remarkable piece of information as clearly conveyed as words can convey—at all events, as clearly as the words of the right hon. Gentleman could convey. He admitted that there might be an element of exaggeration in his former speech; but it is very significant to note the terms in which he refers to the character of the task which would have to be undertaken by anyone who proposed to disestablish the Church of Wales. He said—

"And I say now what I believed then, and what I believe now, that the operation of disestablishing the Church of Wales from the Church of England will not be found very easy. I suspect that it will be found that it is tied and knotted and tangled, I might almost say in such a multitude of legal bonds and meshes with the general body of the Church of England, that it would be a very formidable matter indeed to accomplish this purpose."

Anyone who heard the right hon. Gentleman was conscious of three things:

first, that he was anxious to remove the effect which, during 21 years, his earlier speech had been exercising upon the minds of the people of this country, by the defence which he then made for the Church of Wales; secondly, that he bore emphatic testimony to the good which the Church was doing in Wales; and, thirdly, that he gave notice that whatever might be done by those who should come after him, it would not be for him to do the work of Disestablishment. He did support, in a fashion, that Resolution. He did, I believe, pair in favour of that Resolution; but he rested his case with regard to it not upon any attack on the character or work of the Church in Wales, nor upon the smallness of the minority of the people forming the membership of the Church, but on the ground that the majority of the people of Wales, he believed, desired Disestablishment. Therefore, not upon the ground of Church policy, or high policy, but on the ground of separatism, he accepted that majority for the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. He was yielding to that passing craze of separatism, which has attacked the minority in this House, and which would set up again barriers and fences between the families of our people that have almost been erased and trodden down by the friendly footsteps of many generations. His speech did not greatly help the assailants of the Welsh Church. But what have they themselves to say in regard to the Resolution? I watched the hon. Members the Mover and Seconder of the Resolution, and they have taken warning by what the right hon. Gentleman said last year. They did not this year talk about the Church of England in Wales; nor, indeed, did they make any attempt whatever to prove either of the two propositions contained in the Resolution. The first proposition in this Resolution is—

**"That the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people."**

will examine that proposition presently; but if I had only to deal with the speeches of the Mover and

Seconder of this Resolution, they would require no answer upon that point at all, for they have not attempted to prove that proposition by any particle of evidence that can reasonably be submitted to the judgment of the House. Let us take the second proposition, without passing altogether away from the first, to which I will return. Take the second proposition, that "the Church ministers only to a small minority of the population." If that proposition is true, it ought to be, in some way or other, capable of proof, and the hon. Members who ask the House of Commons to accept a very serious proposition like this, and who lay it down as one of the premises upon which the House is to move to this decision, ought to give us, at all events, some sort of argument or evidence in its favour. But what have these gentlemen done? It is surely very grotesque. The hon. Member for Flintshire, who moved the Resolution, spoke, as he had very good reason for speaking, very doubtfully with regard to statistics. He says that statistics have been freely handled in this House. I am glad to know that they always will be freely handled. I shall say something later on about the statistics prepared by those who have been professionally engaged to support the case which the hon. Gentleman puts before the House, and I shall venture to handle them somewhat freely. The hon. Member has his doubts about statistics; but instead of getting as near as he could to the statistics with regard to the Church in Wales, instead of giving any sort of excuse—good, bad, or indifferent—for having put the proposition down upon the Paper, he gives us statistics as to the attendance at Welsh churches in Liverpool and Welsh churches in America. What nonsense this is the speaker himself must upon reflection see. He could see in a moment that Welshmen who live in Liverpool are for the most part familiar with the English language, and that when he chose churches in Liverpool at which only Welsh is used he is choosing churches which would not in the least represent the attendances in the churches in Wales. As to these indefinite statistics from America, they



seem to be the information of some anonymous person as to that country; they cannot have any relation whatever to the condition of affairs in Wales. And yet the hon. Member, after giving us these fragmentary and irrelevant anecdotes, proceeds to say that he has now overwhelmingly proved his proposition that the people of Wales are Non-conformists. Let me pass on to another matter with which the hon. Member dealt. He says that in past times the Church of Wales was a corrupt and an incompetent Church. He could hardly use expressions of reproach in describing the condition of Church work either in Wales or in England during, say, the reigns of the Georges, with which I should not be inclined, most sorrowfully, to agree. It was not in Wales alone, but in England also, that there was in those days a decadence of the Church work and a degradation in the character of the ministers of the Church which is now a subject of sorrowful reflection. Yet there were always good and holy and religious-minded men in the Church of Wales as well as in the Church of England, who, to the best of their ability, discharged their duty to both God and man in the ministry of the Church; but there were, doubtless, many others of a different character; men who lived—in England as well as in Wales—weak and degraded lives. I am glad to say, however, that in Wales, as well as in England, the Established Church has escaped from the discredit which has been brought upon it by this latter class. Our extrication from these difficulties was probably earlier than in Wales. We in England were a less scattered people; public opinion was more effective and more active, and perhaps it would be right to say that owing to circumstances a higher standard of character had been maintained, so we escaped earlier than in Wales. But thank God the troubles and degradation to which I refer have now almost gone! We have got rid in England, and I believe in Wales, of the drinking parson, the sporting parson, the gambling parson, of the pluralist and the absentee; we have almost got rid of the magistrate parson, and, for my own part, I am very anxious that we should get rid of the political par-

*Sir E. Clarke*

son. These reforms have already been secured to a great extent in both countries, and those who are most active and vigorous in carrying on Church work in England and in Wales are men who devote themselves to discharging their high duties to the State and to the Church in the most self-denying exercise of their great calling. But when this is the case, both in England and in Wales, to what purpose is it that we are to be reminded of those scandals of a century and a half ago, or even of things which may in scattered instances be found a little later? The hon. Member who moved this Resolution gave us as his most recent instance of misconduct in Wales an instance of a Bishop who, in 1830, was enjoying an enormous income and appointing his sons and his nephews to sinecure livings. Sixty-one years is a substantial time in the history of a Religious Body, and during those 61 years the progress of the Church both in England and Wales has been a course of continuous and undisturbed improvement; and now no one, I am sure, can allege or point to any scandal with regard to England or to Wales comparable to that which the hon. Gentleman has spoken of as having existed 61 years ago. Let me suggest to the hon. Member that he was not logical in bringing this sort of evidence before the House in support of his Resolution. If the hon. Member could have said that 150 years ago the Church in Wales was an active, and a vigorous Church, preaching the pure faith, ministering diligently and faithfully to the people, discharging its duties with zeal and with earnestness, whereas now it had lost that pure faith, and the energetic and true life had become corrupt and disorderly and inefficient, then he would have given us some ground for his bringing forward his Motion to disestablish the Church in that part of the United Kingdom. But when he points to the fact that the Church in Wales 150 years ago was feeble and unfit for its Divine work, and that now it has risen to such a pitch of efficiency and of purity that no one will challenge it, and no one will bring an accusation against it, is he not giving us the very best reason in the world for not

destroying a Church whose energy has been revived and purified, and for allowing the country in which it exists to profit by its teaching and its work? I venture to say that in the line he has taken, and the suggestions he has made as to those scandals of a long-gone past being sufficient to induce us to disestablish the Church of Wales, he is directly contradicting the hopes and teachings of those great men whose memory he calls upon us to reverence. Never was a more fitting memorial placed in Westminster Abbey, or one more thoroughly deserved there, than the medallions of the brothers Wesley which are upon its walls. Does not the hon. Member see that in asking us to disestablish the Church in Wales he is acting in direct contradiction to their hopes and principles, and to the Society which they have founded.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: No.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE: I will prove it. The hon. Member has said that the great men he has mentioned—Wesley, Rowland, and Whitfield—had been turned out of the Church. He is mistaken. Wesley and Rowland remained faithful members of the Church, and they lived and died declared members of the Church. I believe there was a time in the early part of his life when Wesley was not admitted to the pulpits of this country; but he was admitted to those pulpits before he died. John Wesley was re-admitted to those pulpits; and his last words, practically the words of testament by Wesley to those who were to follow him in the body which he had founded, constituted a declaration that he lived and died in the Church of England, and he left his dying injunctions to the members of that body that they should never depart from the doctrines and principles of that Church. I must mention another matter. We are sometimes told that the Church ought to be Disestablished in order that she may be freed from control. We have had a scene in this House, upon the 29th July of last year, a scene which was very painful to all Churchmen who were trying to pass a Bill to enable the Church to expel from its benefices clergymen who had been guilty of gross immorality or other

grave offences. That Bill was opposed, and the Churchmen were told in so many words that we should not be allowed to purify the Church; and that if we wanted a measure to give power to the Church to purify itself, we must consent to Disestablishment. I remember on that occasion three hon. Members on the opposite side of this House—the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton, the hon. Member for the Eccles Division of Lancashire, and the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool—all protesting against this opposition, and the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool said that to postpone dealing with grave scandals until they could deal with the question of Establishment would be a crying injustice. But it is a mistake to say that a disestablished Church would be a free Church, free from control. At the present moment the great Nonconformist Bodies of this country are limited not only as to their discipline, but as to their doctrine, by bonds which Parliament alone can break. The papers yesterday had a quotation from the *Methodist Recorder* with regard to a proposed change in the regulations of the body which follows John Wesley; and the section of the deed poll which the Wesleyan Methodists are now coming to Parliament to ask to be relieved from by Act of Parliament, is a very remarkable one. They cannot now allow a minister to remain more than three years upon a circuit, and the Wesleyan Methodists are now coming to Parliament asking to be relieved from that regulation which prevents them appointing any person for more than three years successively to the use and enjoyment of any of their chapels, and I think the hon. Member, when he speaks of a free Church, will find in the last line of this section a very interesting refutation. It was enacted by the eleventh section of Mr. Wesley's deed poll, of the 28th of February, 1784, that—

“The Conference shall not, nor may, nominate or appoint any person to the use and enjoyment of, or to preach and expound God's Holy Word in any of the chapels and premises so given or conveyed, or which may be given or conveyed upon the trusts aforesaid, who was not either a member of the Conference or admitted into connection with the same, or

upon trial as aforesaid, nor appoint any person for more than three years successively to the use and enjoyment of any chapel and premises already given, or to be given or conveyed upon the trusts aforesaid, except ordained ministers of the Church of England."

At this moment the only persons the Wesleyan Methodist Conference can by law continue more than three years in one place are the ordained ministers of the Church of England. But, Sir, I go further even than this. In the year 1818 there was constituted by Conference a Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Society, and in the year 1871 an Act was passed, the 34th & 35th Vic., Chapter 40, which gave legislative sanction to the Constitution arrived at in 1818. It was enacted by Section 4 that—

"Nothing in this Act contained shall authorise any alteration in the doctrine of the Society as set forth in Part II. of the General Principle of the Methodist Constitution."

Another section allowed them to vary parts of the Constitution which referred only to discipline. The Schedule of that Act contains different parts of that Methodist Constitution, from which I will read an extract—

"Does not the Methodist Society profess to belong to the Church of England? Yes, as a body, for they originally emanated from the Church of England. They originally emanated from the Church of England, and the Rev. John Wesley, the venerable founder of the Connexion, made a declaration of a similar import within less than a year preceding his decease, 'I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.'—(See *Arminian Magazine* for April, 1790.) "This regulation is not intended to be understood as interfering with the right of private judgment in places where education or prejudices attach members to other Established Churches."

That, Sir, is in the Designs, Part 1, which they are at liberty to alter; but in Part 2, which that body cannot alter except by coming to Parliament, we find this, "What is the foundation of the Methodist doctrine? The Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Wherein consists the unity of the Methodist doctrine?" The hon. Member who moved this Resolution said that the doctrine was drawn pure and direct from Holy Writ. I will read to him the doctrine which is obligatory by Act of Parliament upon this body; it cannot be altered

without the consent of Parliament. The Primitive Methodist Society of Ireland—

An hon. MEMBER: Is it a public Act or a private Act?

SIR E. CLARKE: A public Act. The hon. Member will find it on the Table from which I have taken it, and the answer given to the question of what the unity of the Methodist doctrines consisted was as follows:—

"Answer.—In teaching and enforcing those doctrines only which are contained in the Scriptures, as taught and explained in the writings of the Rev. John Wesley and the Rev. John Fletcher, particularly Mr. Wesley's notes on the Old and New Testament, his eight volumes of sermons, his appeals, and the doctrinal parts of the *Arminian Magazine* as maintained by him and published to the period of his decease; also Mr. Fletcher's checks and letters, published by Mr. Wesley."

And when the hon. Member speaks of the freedom of the Church which is not established as the Church of England, has he forgotten for the moment if any body such as a Church comes to be possessed of property or endowment of any sort or kind, there is a condition of things established which prevents it from altering its doctrines or the terms of its membership except by appeal to the House of Commons? With regard to the matter of the number of people in Wales, the hon. Member for Swansea made an observation as to his wish for a census. Well, we have always wished for a census, we are anxious to have a census. It is not the fault of Churchmen that there has not been a census made in Wales as there is in Ireland, to ascertain the religious opinions of the people. Hon. Members on the other side may be well justified in the opposition that they make to that proposal. I do not complain; they form their own judgment in the matter, and they object to our proposal being carried out; but, at all events, if they object to any record being taken by an independent and authoritative body, it is not for them to ask that we shall accept the amateur and somewhat suspicious attempts that they make to get these returns. With regard to this question, which I consider an important one, the hon. Member who moved the Resolution gave the go-by altogether to that part of the

Sir E. Clarke

ase, and says fairly, "I do not choose to deal with Welsh statistics." I do not think that is quite satisfactory; I think we ought to be able to find out in some way what is the proportion between Churchmen and Nonconformists in Wales. The Nonconformists say they desire to obtain returns of the attendances at our churches. Well, they have made several attempts to do this. In the year 1887, it was announced that a religious census was about to be taken by a very active and vigorous Nonconformist in Wales. He was believed to have taken it. He did not publish it. About two years later he published fragments of it, and explained that in the cases in which he had taken returns he had a private census taken for the re-consideration of the figures. I do not say the figures even were not true. One cannot say that; there was no comparative statement on the other side by which to test it, but I do say they cannot call upon us to pay any very great respect to an amateur experiment of this kind, founded upon a principle unfair to the churches and unfairly applied. I say a principle unfair to the churches." When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian had occasion in this House to discuss some years ago—I think 40 years ago—the Motion of Mr. Miall with regard to the disestablishment of the Church of England, he protested against the idea that you could test the efficiency of an Established Church by counting the number of persons present at a single service upon a particular Sunday. If you took the number of persons present at special worship you would not establish a fair comparison between the Established Church and other bodies which thought much more of the preaching of the Word, and of attending at particular times in their churches and chapels. It would not be a fair comparison. But I will make for examination a very recent example—the most recent return I think—taken by one of those who have been professionally engaged in support of the Liberationist movement in Wales. There has been a Wales Campaign Fund started, and one of these needy Nonconformists of Wales have given sums of £500 each to

establish that fund. I will not inquire too curiously how it has been spent, but I believe it has been partly spent in obtaining the Returns published in the *Times* newspaper in December of last year. Mr. Owen Owens published in the *Times* of the 18th December, 1891, a Return which he had obtained from an inquiry set on foot by him into the attendance at churches in the diocese of St. Asaph; and he said that the Return he gave showed that "the proportion of attendants at church on a Sunday did not reach 10 per cent. of the population." It was a curious conclusion, and I should like to tell the House how it was arrived at. There were 73 churches taken in the diocese of St. Asaph's. He got out a total of 113,000 persons in the population and of 11,009 persons in attendance in the churches; and he said that taking these figures they represented a proportion of something less than 10 per cent. I do not think that 10 per cent. is an insignificant number when you take the attendance at one service only, at a church in a rural and somewhat wild district in many parts, upon an extremely inclement day in the month of November. But let me take it. This census can be examined, and has been examined, and the figures which I am going to refer to have been published, and have never been answered. At Wrexham, the amateur who was present on that day omitted five places of Church worship altogether, and he estimated the population at Wrexham at not less than 2,000 persons below its real number. In one place the two enumerators were aged respectively eleven and thirteen years, and as might have been expected from such juvenile officials, there was a difference of 45 per cent. between them. But in nine places—9 churches out of 73—the numbers given as at the congregation service were smaller than the number of communicants who had communicated at these churches upon the Easter Sunday. I need not draw the inference from that fact. But there was one place of all these 73 which was correct, and only one. It was the parish of Hawarden, and the parish of Hawarden, a large parish, with over 6,000 inhabitants,

has I am very glad to say a diligent Church ministry and a large attendance at the services. The parish of Hawarden came out in these returns in a way which corresponds with the returns made by the Rector of Hawarden, to the Bishop of the diocese. The explanation is an interesting one. The Rector of Hawarden, is the Rev. Stephen Gladstone, who knew this inquiry was to be made, and offered to give the persons who were conducting the inquiry the figures himself. They accepted the figures, and thus the parish of Hawarden had the singular distinction of being the only correct return, so far as we can see, in the whole of the 73. Now, Sir, this is an example of the statistics which have been given by our opponents. With regard to them, I do not impute bad faith. The controversy we are engaged in to-day is a controversy which may last for many years and involve much—(Cries of “No, no!” from the Opposition Benches)—may last for many years, and, for my own part, I will take care, from the beginning to the end of this controversy, that no word shall be spoken by me which will embitter the antagonism among those who, to my thinking, ought to be working for and in one common cause. I have given an example now of the statistics with regard to ourselves. Let me give something which I confess I am inclined to consider more trustworthy. There are reasons, as I have shown you, to distrust these statistics about us. I think we are entitled to accept the statistics of our antagonists in this matter about themselves. With regard to them, I think they ought not to complain if we examine their own statistics and apply them to the consideration of the question, and I want to ask the attention of the House to the result of some interesting statistics. The four large bodies of Nonconformists in Wales are—the Calvinistic Methodists, who I believe outnumber by about one-half any other Nonconformist body. I think the four largest bodies are the Calvinistic Methodists, the Independents, the Wesleyans, and the Baptists, and they comprise the large majority, almost the whole, of the Nonconformist population of Wales. Now, these four

bodies issue every year an account of their Church membership. Two of them issue the account in this form. The Calvinistic Methodists and the Independents give a table of the number of members of their Church, and they also give the number of the adherents of the Churches. It is an important matter to remember what an adherent means, and I shall read the definition of adherent, which is an authoritative definition of the Nonconformist Body—

“Adherent includes all who attend regularly or irregularly at Nonconformist places of worship, all who avail themselves of the religious services of ministers or members of the Nonconformist Body on the occasion of sickness or death in their family, and children of all ages.”

In other words, all who can be directly or indirectly described as a Nonconformist. The adherents of the Calvinistic Methodists and Independents, are just over twice as many as the members. Applying these figures to the other two bodies, who give only the number of members but not of adherents, and doubling their figures, or rather more than doubling their figures, in order to produce a fair result, the result of this is: The total adherents in Wales, including Monmouthshire, of the four largest Nonconformist Bodies is, according to the last Return—that of 1890—814,277, from their own books. That is 46 per cent. of the population of the country. I think the hon. Member for Swansea, some years ago, gave an estimate in this House of the number of persons who were Nonconformists, including under that total the Roman Catholics, who were not included in these four Bodies, and he estimated them at 55,000. I believe 56,000 is about right. That would add another 3 per cent. to the Nonconformist Body; and so, according to their own statistics, including adherents, including every child and everybody casually brought into contact with the body, the largest number they can claim of members and of adherents attached as loosely as possible to their body, when added to the number outside this body, comes to 49 per cent. only of the population.

MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire): Supposing the rest conform?

Sir E. Clarke

SIR E. CLARKE: I shall finish my statement, but I assure the hon. Member I shall not omit to notice the question. But there is another very interesting fact with regard to this. Nonconformity is not evenly distributed over Wales. The eastern part of Wales—the seven counties which may rightly be called the eastern part of Wales—are places of large population and of increasing population. The six counties in the west

Wales are places more sparsely populated, of decreasing population. In the seven eastern counties, which contain 72 per cent. of the population, the adherents of the Nonconformist churches, including Roman Catholics, are more numerous in that than any other part of Wales, amounting only 35 per cent. of the population. That, according to their own statistics, that part of Wales which is increasing in population, and full of prosperity and promise for the future, is not much more than one-third of the population that, by any method of calculation, can be brought within the Nonconformist Body. It was said, "Do the others conform?" I do not understand the question. There is no such thing as conformity to an Established Church in the sense which it necessarily has when dealing with the Nonconformist Body. The claim of the Church is that all belong to her, and are entitled to her ministrations; that the doors of her churches are open to all, the ministration of the Sacraments given to all, that the consolations of religion will be given to her clergy to all people amongst whom they live. The strength and power of the Established Church is that she directs her unceasing effort that large body which may not come into direct relation with any religious community at all, but which is subject to the influence of Christianity and the influence of the teaching of a worthy church; and, again, I say no one will say—I am sure the hon. Member for Enniscorthy himself, who is going to speak this Debate, will not deny—the value of the ministrations of the ministers of the Welsh Church, although they may be given to those who have not absolutely declared themselves to be members of a religious body. It was not in

a hasty or debating speech that the hon. Member expressed, not long ago, the very highest opinion of the work of the Welsh clergy. In an article, I think in 1885, in the *Nineteenth Century*, or about that time, he paid his testimony to the character of the clergy in Wales, and a better or more hearty eulogium could not be expected from the most devoted defender of Church Establishment. As the question has been asked, I should just like to point out this. It has been said how about those who lie outside of the membership of the Nonconformist Body. But when one is talking about the membership of the Nonconformist Body, and the number of Nonconformist chapels, and the number of Nonconformist ministers in Wales, one is necessarily exaggerating to a great degree the influence that Nonconformity has in Wales. I will give an instance. In the Diocese of St. Asaph's there are 208 churches of the Established Church. These 208 churches are served by 312 clergymen, and in each parish there is a resident clergyman, who has in some cases assistant curates, attending to the people among whom they live. What is the case with the Nonconformist Body? The Calvinistic Methodists are a very strong body in the Diocese of St. Asaph's. They have 330 chapels in that Diocese. But they have only 70 pastors. Of these 70 pastors 35 have more than one chapel to attend to; and there are forty-three other persons who make up the ministry of the Calvinistic Methodists in that diocese to the number of 113. Altogether, there are 43 persons besides these pastors—men, no doubt, of exemplary life and great capacity to lead others to a religious life—but persons obliged to occupy their daily time in other and secular employment.

MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Like St. Paul.

SIR E. CLARKE: I heard the interruption. If St. Paul had not had to work for his living he would have had more time to work for his Master. ("Oh, oh!") And I say, while these men may be men of good qualities to guide and lead and encourage others in religion, at all events they cannot, by the nature of things, give such constant pastoral care

to the people amongst whom they live, as could be given by those whose whole lives are spent in the discharge of those duties. There exist, then, 330 chapels in the diocese of St. Asaph's; there are 70 pastors. Of these 70 pastors 35 have more than one chapel to attend to. I do not care to dwell upon this subject. I do not care—for my part, I absolutely refuse—to make any attack upon the organisation or work of the Nonconformist Bodies; but I propose to read to the House an extract, not from a writer upon our side, but from a writer who was speaking from the Nonconformist side with regard to this matter. On the 14th May, 1891, there appeared a leading article in the *Goleuad*, which is the official organ of the Calvinistic Methodists in Wales. This is an extract from the leading article:—

"As is seen in the figures used by Mr. Roberts, our chapels (*eglwys*) throughout North and South Wales number 1,258; of these, 724 are in North Wales, including three in Liverpool and Manchester. According to our diary there are only 236 pastors to take care of all these churches. . . . Let us take an example. We know a district within a presbytery in North Wales where there are 19 churches, and there is only one pastor in the whole district. In cases of illness amongst our members, and when special circumstances call for the presence of a minister, to marry, to baptise, to promote beneficent movements, such as temperance, &c., to hold classes for the young people, to defend the rights of Nonconformists against civil and religious violence and oppression, the Calvinistic Methodists have only one pastor for this tract of country. In the same district there are at least ten clergymen, the great majority of them evincing great zeal for the "Mother Church," and untiring in their efforts to win Nonconformists to their fold. Read the reports of the Sunday Schools in this district, and you find a very great decline in the work of the schools."

I think we are entitled to point out to hon. Members who are seeking to disturb and destroy the work of that Church which maintains in every parish throughout the diocese a clergyman diligent in the performance of his duty, and ministering to the people in whose midst he is placed; it is right for us to remind them that those on their own side, who are most deeply and ardently interested in the work of Calvinistic Methodism, lament the fact, that by the paucity of their pastors as compared with the numbers of their

churches, their people are practically left without guardianship, and practically without guidance in spiritual matters. Sir, the time may come when the timid inveracities of this Resolution shall give place to a formal scheme proposed to Parliament by a Minister of the Crown for the humiliation and the despoiling of the Church. If that day should come how will the opposing ranks be filled, and in what principles will the defenders of the Church find their inspiration. We are sometimes told that we are defending vested interests and a Government Department. Sir, to some of us it is no question of the defence of a political institution. The Church is of Divine foundation, its system is Divinely ordered, its faith Divinely guarded from corruption or decay. In the Establishment we find the privilege and obligation of a universal duty; in the endowments which the piety of her sons has, in past ages, consecrated to the Divine service we see the guarantee for the independence of her ministers, and for that unflinching service of charity by which far more than this her heritage is given directly to the poor in the relief of ignorance and sorrow, of sickness and of want. In our belief the inheritance of the Church is the most precious possession of the poor. This is not your belief, but it is that which I share with millions of my fellow-countrymen. Many of those are to be found in the ranks of the Liberal Party; many who, in presence of such considerations as these, will refuse to join in a policy of destruction. But these will not be all. There will, I believe, be with us many who do not share in this belief, do not approve the system of the Church, and do not profess her creed, but who accept as their rule of political conduct something better than the party expediency of the moment. What, Sir, is the characteristic of the higher statesmanship of the day? It is that the principle that the welfare of the people is the supreme law is becoming more and more the rule of our legislation, and of all the activities of our public life. And this other truth we ought to have learned, that the welfare of the people does not mainly depend upon forms of Government, or

*Sir E. Clarke*

the arrangement of political privileges, even on the distribution of the national wealth. It depends on the character of the people. Who will deny that the teaching of the National Church is one of the most potent of all the influences which form and elevate the national character. Fixed in a pure and manly faith, secured by the very conditions of its establishment from the spasmodic extravagances of religious fervour, and the more permanent anger of priestly domination, it is the strongest of all existing forces to strengthen and refine the spirit of our people, and to teach them that in the fulfilment of Christian duty lies the only hope of protecting our social life from the extremes of a cynical selfishness on the one hand, and on the other from the vagaries of a fantastic and predatory socialism. Sir, we the Tory Party gladly and gratefully accept the honourable duty of standing foremost in this cause. But we believe that as the years go by there will come to our side more and more of those who place the national welfare above the ties of a political combination, and will claim to share with us the patriotic work of guarding the inseparable interests of the Church and the people.

(6.8.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I have listened, and I am sure the House has listened, with interest and admiration to the ingenious and eloquent address of the hon. and learned Gentleman. I admired his speech in many respects and not least in this, that it was so very skilful and successful in diverting attention from the points of the case which are most vital, and dwelling at length on propositions which none of us dispute, and introducing matter entirely irrelevant to the case. The Solicitor General began by the artifice familiar to hon. Gentlemen opposite—that is quoting and dilating upon *dicta*, which have fallen in the course of his long life from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. But the hon. and learned Gentleman improved upon former examples by quoting from the right hon. Gentleman when he was not content to correct the twistings and dislocations from their context of the extracts which he used. Now, Sir, it

seems to me that the census statistics which always form a large feature in these Debates may well be left to be dealt with by the Welsh Members. The figures however of the Solicitor General deserve a little notice. He claimed that all who were not proved to be Nonconformists must be assumed to be members of the Church of England. It seems to me that those in Wales in whom the spirit, life and convictions of religion is doing work, attach themselves to the Nonconformists, and only in small proportions to the Church of England. The Solicitor General went on to a more questionable view. He made it apparently ground of accusation against the Nonconformist body that they were so poor as not to be able to have separate and settled ministers for each of their churches. I have thought that was rather a testimony to the fervent attachment of the Nonconformists in Wales to their clergy and churches, when they come to those churches in spite of the comparatively scant ministrations which are offered to them, and when with all their poverty the Nonconformist Churches are able to take a firmer hold on the attachment and attendance of the people than the Church of England, with all her appliances, can do. The Solicitor General went a step further, and in reply to a reference to St. Paul he observed that St. Paul would probably have done much better if he had had nothing but preaching to do. Well, that is a moral to most of us. I think the Nonconformist ministers will be satisfied if nothing worse than that can be said of them, that they followed in the steps of St. Paul—only that the Solicitor General thinks St. Paul was only a moderate success, and that much more would have been accomplished if St. Paul had been a preacher and nothing else. Sir, I must say I was struck by a certain amount of unreality in the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He has dealt with this matter as if he were pleading a cause in those Courts which his eloquence adorns. He has attempted to divert the minds of hon. Members from the real issue, as he did in the case of those other clients whose claims he advocated with so much zeal, when



the question of licensing compensation was before the House. He gives us forensic arguments based upon the alleged inaccuracy of certain statistics alleged to be inaccurate. He assumes that Members of this House are not to know anything more about Wales than can be learned from evidence that can be called and cross-examined upon in Court, or from statements made by witnesses upon affidavit. Anyone who approaches this question in the spirit of a practical statesman would have given the House the credit of knowing that the majority of the people of Wales are Nonconformist. Be the figures three-fourths to one-fourth, four-fifths to one-fifth, or five-sixths to one-sixth—all these estimates are made—the plain and broad fact stands out, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has said, that the Church of England in Wales is the Church not only of the rich but of the small minority. We have here a comparatively simple case to deal with. It is not a question of Establishment generally, but a very special and peculiar case that ought to be tried on its own merits. It is the case of an Established Church with every advantage, with undisputed possession, with a great line of ancient tradition behind it—because the Church in Wales is the legitimate historical succession to the Church of St. David—it is the case of an Established Church with all these advantages that has completely failed to make herself a National Church. It is, moreover, a conspicuous instance of failure, because in Wales those conditions for which Established Churches are supposed to be specially needed and to have a special chance of success, have been abundantly prevalent. It is constantly claimed for a National Church that it ought to draw in, and embody and give visible shape to the natural feelings of the people, that it ought to be in accord with their traditions, supported by their sentiment and affection, and be able to give shape to their natural life. It was also claimed by the Solicitor General with great eloquence that the Established Church ought to be the church of the poor; that it is her special mission and function to take the poor under her protection, and do for them what they are unable to do

for themselves. In Wales the Church has had a great and effectual door to her in these respects. The Welsh are a religious people. Their religion is more constant and devout than of any other people in these respects. They are a patriotic people and devoted to their national language, their national songs, their national traditions. Wales is a poor country. It is poorer in proportion to its number than England; and yet in both of these respects—as regards her national character and her hold upon the people—the Church of England in Wales has been a most conspicuous failure. The national life of the Established Church, all the religious fervour, gone out into the Nonconformist movement. I do not say all the people have lost it, but I say that the passion, the fervour, the ardour of religion, the attachment to the Welsh language, to Welsh history, and to Welsh nationality, have gone to the Nonconformists; and masses have drifted away from the Established Church, leaving it the Church of the rich and not of the poor, the Church of the few and not of the many. Why? Because the Church is established; because it is the organisation of an Established Church. That happens because the Church being endowed and having benefices, the people saw her wealth and her benefices despoiled for the benefit of England. That process began early in the history of Wales when the tithes of the South Welsh Churches were taken away and given to the Abbeys of Gloucester and Tewkesbury. It is because the Church has been an Endowed Church that those misfortunes mentioned in its history have befallen her. The fact is it is the Church of the rich, a Church which does not look for, and does not depend upon, the contributions of the poor, which does not possess the obvious motive of going to the poor and associating itself with the life of the poor—it is that which made it sink into the lethargy of the last century and caused the people to drift into the hands of the Nonconformists. I do not think the fact was put too strongly by John Bright when he used these striking words:—

*Mr. Bryce*

"It is the Establishment that has killed the Church in Wales."

That is the case we present to the House, and it is a case which the Solicitor General has not answered. It cannot be said that religion would languish without the Established Church because with the Established Church it has languished. It cannot be said that the Established Church if disestablished and disendowed will not be able to support its religious ministrations, because it has a very strong claim upon the superabundant wealth of the people of England. It cannot be said in defence of the continued existence of the Church that it is justified because of the necessity of maintaining an educated clergy in every parish; because, Sir—thanks to the opening of the Universities of Oxford and of Cambridge—there are now in the Nonconformist Churches, and particularly among the younger men, those who can hold their own in education and intelligence with the parsons of the Church. It was said by a former dignitary of the Church:—

"There were educated men, but they could not speak Welsh; there were men who could speak Welsh, but they were not educated. The educated men could not speak to the people; those who could speak to them had nothing to tell them."

The reason the Solicitor General gave us why the Church of England in Wales should be allowed to hold its own against the wishes of the great majority of the people was that it is improving. I admit that gladly and heartily. I do not think it is denied by any on this side of the House. I have the pleasure of knowing many clergymen of the Established Church in Wales, and I know that many of them are men of the highest character and attainments, and of the strongest devotion to their duties. But I have always felt that they are in a very painful and even in a very false position. They are put out of touch with the sentiments of the people; they are forced into an attitude of proselytism, obliged to make themselves the agents, whether they liked it or not, of the proselytising spirit that is now so active in Wales, and forced into that very position to which the Solicitor General made reference, that against

their will they are made political partisans. Their idea of their loyalty to their Church requires them to take part in political agitation on their own behalf, and forces them into opposition, not only to their nonconforming brethren, but to a great many of those among whom they live. It is from that we desire to relieve them, and if hon. Members opposite knew as much about Wales and her clergymen as I do, having travelled all over the country in the course of my duties connected with a public mission, they would know that these difficulties were very pressing and very painful to some of the best and wisest men of the Church in Wales. There is another observation which must rise in every man's mind when he hears the improvement of the Church in Wales referred to. Institutions have gone on improving just as the hand of the reformer was upon them. No institution ever was at its worst when it was reformed. That is only natural, and it arose not because the institution began to improve when threatened, not alone because of the spirit which works outside for a drastic and speedy reform, but also because there is a spirit work which works inside for a softer and milder reform in the essence of the institution itself. Let me mention a couple of cases. When the Bastille was taken there were found very few prisoners in it. It was not taken at the time when the real grievances existed, but at a time when the improving influences had been at work. I need not remind the House that the Established Church in Ireland at the time of its disestablishment had been improving in every respect—in the character of its ministers, in the attachment of those who belong to it, in its relations with the people. I do not think, therefore, that the House need be surprised that the Church is improving in view of the prospect that lies before it of a drastic reform. Sir, I protest against the language used by the Solicitor General when he asked us not to destroy this edifice. We propose to relieve the Church from an indefensible position, to set it free from the trammels in which it is now bound. We propose to give it a far stronger claim upon the liberality and

attachment of its people than what it can have as an established and endowed Church. We believe that the success it has attained of late years, and the increase of attachment to it on the part of the people, have been gained not so much by it as a State Church, but by it in the very measureable proportion in which it becomes a voluntary Church. It is because it has had not to rely upon its endowments, but because it has had to appeal to the liberality and attachment of its non-adherents, that it is more prosperous than it was before. We think a little more of this kind of influence will do it still more good. We believe that when it is thrown entirely upon its own resources it will rise to the strength that it has not yet attained, and will fulfil better than ever those purposes for which it exists. It raises very large sums already. It can raise still larger ones. The sums it has raised are small in proportion to the wealth of its adherents, to those which are raised by the nonconforming bodies. Now, there is one other argument which I know is always dwelt on in this case. The Solicitor General did not, except in passing, advert to it. It is the argument that the Church in Wales is one with the Church in England. He did advert in one point to that argument, because near the beginning of his speech he referred to what he called "the craze of separatism which seems to have seized upon a Political Party in this country." He attributed the desire for disestablishment in Wales to what he called this "craze of separatism," by which I suppose he intended to describe the desire of any people or race, or nation within these realms to have such legislation as they desire, and suited to their own needs. Now I am not going to argue the question whether Wales is a nation, but I will say there are present in Wales—and no man with open eyes can deny it—conditions and circumstances which make it so unlike England that it ought to be dealt with differently from England. Before I part from that word "separation," I should like to remind the Solicitor General as to who it was who first broached this doctrine of separation, as he called it, with reference to Established Churches. We do

not claim, Mr. Speaker, what may be called the patent of that view—that the question of an Established Church in one part of these islands should be dealt with according to the wishes of the people inhabiting that part of the country. That doctrine was first laid down by a noble Lord who used to lead one section in this House, and who was at that time the Leader of the Liberal Party—the noble Lord who is now the Duke of Devonshire. Speaking in Scotland, he laid down the proposition that the wishes of the people of Scotland ought to be conclusive as to the establishment or non-establishment of the Church of Scotland. He declared that it was for the Scottish people to say whether they wished that Church to be established or not. It is upon the basis of that doctrine that my hon. Friends proceed when they say that the wishes of the Welsh people ought similarly to be accepted as conclusive with regard to the existence of the Establishment in Wales. I know it will be said that the Church in Wales is one with the Church in England, and that it must be defended for the sake of the Church in England. What does this mean? If the Established Church in Wales were a church distinct from the Church in England; if it were another religious body altogether, and if three-fourths of the people of these islands were opposed to it, and did not belong to it, would he still contend that it ought to remain as an Establishment? Clearly not. Suppose that the Church being one with the Church of England, should nevertheless exist in a separate island, would it be contended, with the precedent set in the case of Ireland, that it should remain established only because it is part of the Church of England? We arrive, therefore, at this conclusion, that the church establishment in Wales is to be maintained because it is one with the Church of England, and because Wales is contiguous by land with England, adjoining England, and on the land frontier, instead of lying by itself in the sea. Therefore the argument which the Tory Party and the Solicitor General are obliged to put to the Welsh people is this. You are to continue to acquiesce in an Establishment which three-fourths

*Mr. Bryce*

of your people reject and which nine-tenths of your Members reject—because I believe that the division of Welsh Members at present is 27 to 3. You are to continue to maintain this Church, which you hold to be a grievance, for the sake of England, because it is one with the Church of England and because some injury will be inflicted upon England and the Church of England on cutting away this Welsh Church. I think that is an argument which the people of Wales will be very slow to accept. They will say, why should we be sacrificed for England? I do not claim that for every purpose Wales should be considered as a distinct country, but I do claim that for many purposes Wales is so distinct a country that it ought to receive special treatment. You, yourselves, have admitted it in your Acts, which are intended for Wales alone, because you felt that the condition of Wales and the wishes of the people were special elements in the question. I say no man can go into Wales without feeling, not only in the language, but also in the character of the people, and in their social and economical conditions, that there are many facts which suggest independent legislation for them. The Welsh people at any rate feel as a nation. No one who knows the Welsh can doubt that the pulse of national life beats very strong in the veins of the people. I think the only effect of the continued denial of the claims of the people of Wales for legislation, which they desire to have, will be to intensify what you call the separatist and distinct feeling, and to strengthen the cry for Home Rule. If now, you adopt the prudent policy of making timely concessions to Wales, you would appease those demands and reduce the claims which they make to a compass in which you would find nothing to object to. But if you insist upon flouting and disregarding their wishes you will increase the demand for separatist government, and you will heap faggots upon the fire of Home Rule. I have only one word more to say on the effect of this policy on the Church of England. You say the Church must be defended because she is one with the Church of England. That was said in 1868 and 1869, in

regard to the Church in Ireland, which was united by a Statute, and a very solemn Statute to the Church of England. Such arguments were used with far more force then, because it was alleged that the process must go on at once in England. Nobody I suppose on the opposite Benches would now propose to re-establish on a Protestant basis the Church in Ireland. Nobody will deny that the Church is not weaker than it was in 1869. I believe myself she is far more defensible than when linked to an altogether indefensible sister church. So will it be now if Disestablishment is carried out for Wales. There is a metaphor which I notice is generally used by those who support the Church in such a Debate as this. It was used last year:—

*“The Established Church in Wales is an outwork of the Church of England, and an outwork which must be defended.”*

This metaphor, I know, has had considerable influence on people's minds. I would like to observe there is such a thing in war as an indefensible outwork, there is such a thing as an outwork from which a prudent general retires, because he knows that he cannot permanently hold it, because he knows that it weakens his forces and his position as a whole. If that be the case of the Established Church in Wales, I believe that the sooner the Church of England retires from it the stronger will she be within her own walls. This question of Established Churches is not a new matter. An attempt has twice been made to force Established Churches upon nations which did not wish to have them—once in Scotland, and once in Ireland. Do you suppose that now in times which are more peaceful, but in times which are much more democratic, and when the wishes of the Representatives of the people are admitted to be conclusive, you can permanently deny this demand of the Welsh people. I do not know what hon. Members opposite will think, but I would remind them of the proverb, which says that even an opponent may say that which is true. And I would venture to say that the state of matters in Wales is such, that for the sake of the peace and good feeling of the Church, not less than respect for

the wishes of the people of Wales, the Tory Party ought to retire from their position as to the Church in Wales as soon as they possibly can.

\*(6.46.) SIR JOHN PULESTON (Devonport): I do not wish to intervene for any lengthened time in this Debate. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has dwelt very forcibly upon the idea that we are here to disestablish the Welsh Church in order to strengthen the Church in England. Now, I want to know—we all want to know—how far that is the opinion of hon. Members sitting on that side of the House—how far does it accord with the view of the Liberation Society and all its agents who were working for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales? I am sure the hon. Gentleman and those who sit with him, and behind him, will not desire to put forth arguments in favour of the Resolution upon any false pretences, but certainly, if we may assume that he is speaking for the Party upon his side of the House, who are in favour of this Motion, a new development has taken place in the discussion this evening, and we shall now be able to quote the hon. Gentleman, believing that he represents his Party, and the statement that the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales is only asked for by them in order that it may strengthen the establishment in England.

MR. BRYCE: The hon. Member will perhaps permit me to state that I did not say anything of the kind. I said nothing about the motive we had in asking for it, or rather I said the motive we had in asking for it was a totally different thing, but I pointed out to hon. Members opposite, who are legitimately interested in the Church of England that it would not weaken her.

SIR J. PULESTON: I am glad the hon. Gentleman has got up, because it is important to have the matter clear. At the same time, the effect of the statement made by the hon. Gentleman in his speech indubitably and clearly was that Disestablishment of the Church in Wales would greatly strengthen—that is the hon. Gentleman's word—the Establishment in England, and it is certainly a legitimate conclusion to draw

from his words. This Resolution was put down on the Paper to apply only to Wales, but was there no sinister motive for inserting the wedge of a larger measure of Disestablishment in England? It is important, I think, to understand that. Now, Sir, it is a little singular, after the very eloquent speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian (Mr. Gladstone), whose absence I am sure we all regret to-night—after his strong statements, some of which were quoted by my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General in his eloquent speech to-night, condemning the terms of the Resolution, that that Resolution should appear again in the same terms this year. The Resolution proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for Flintshire states—

“That as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people.”

The hon. Gentleman opposite objects to having his Leader, in his absence, inconveniently quoted; but, on the other hand, I may say, in passing, he did not object to quote the Duke of Devonshire on a point to which there may have been, I think, some reply, because it was distinctly taken out of its context; but there can be no mistaking the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. It is emphatic; and every sentence can be taken collectively or separately. One quotation was made by my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General on the subject. I can give another, in which the right hon. Gentleman said—

“The efforts and exertions of the Church in Wales now and for a good many years, and the growing and increasing efforts, are such as do in my opinion great credit, both to the clergy and the laity of that Church. I render them ungrudging recognition, and I do not think it my duty on this occasion to withhold any portion of the praise which is justly their due.”

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian said a great deal in the same direction, and certainly setting completely at naught the arguments which have been made by my hon. Friend who moved the Resolution, and by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down as to the present condition of the Church in Wales. Then, as to the

*Mr. Bryce*

statistics, both hon. Gentlemen who have spoken wisely avoided going into all the details. I do not propose to go into them either, but I believe there is one thing which has been made perfectly clear, namely, that less than one-half, or at least not more than one-half of the people of Wales are avowed Nonconformists. That, I think, there is no question about. That, I believe, is an admission which was made when my hon. and learned Friend was speaking. It was desired in this House to have a Religious census, but hon. Gentlemen opposite made that impossible, and particularly the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Denbighshire (Mr. G. Osborne Morgan). But immediately after we separated for the Session, amateur censuses were taken all over Wales, and encouraged by the same right hon. Gentleman who refused to have an official census made by the Government.

MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN: I did not.

SIR J. PULESTON: The right hon. Gentleman publicly, by letters and speeches, made it impossible.

MR. G. OSBORNE MORGAN: I in no way encouraged the taking of these informal censuses.

SIR J. PULESTON: No; but the right hon. Gentleman has been very prompt in quoting them and using them in his speeches. Therefore, if that is not an equivalent to encouragement, I do not know what is. I will refer to my hon. Friend the Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs (Mr. Lloyd-George), and I do so because he has been, as is well known, put forward as a prominent advocate of the Disestablishment question. His views of the principle upon which the claim for Disestablishment is based happen to differ very much from those put forward to-night, and he is supposed to represent, at all events, a considerable section of the Disestablishment party in Wales. When speaking the other day, he threw overboard altogether the issue of religious equality and Church freedom, upon which alone the claim for Disestablishment has been made here to-night, and based the claim for Disestablishment in Wales wholly upon Welsh national grounds. It is quite open to the hon. Gentleman

to base it upon that ground or any other, but it is right to show to the House that the claim made by hon. Gentlemen who have spoken to-night, namely, that it is based upon the cause of religious freedom, is not accepted by others who are advocating Disestablishment. The hon. Member went on to say, and in the same speech—

“We have to consider the English Constituencies, and that, unfortunately, there are still a few Liberal politicians who regard religious equality as good enough for Irishmen and Welshmen, but utterly inapplicable to their own countrymen; and the significance of Welsh disestablishment would lie in the fact that it was the first great political measure recognising the separate national existence of Wales.”

I quote from the hon. Member's speech, which is one of several utterances making for the same line of thought and argument, to show that behind this effort at Disestablishment there is a great deal more than this question of religious equality and Church freedom. In Wales, the advocates of Disestablishment—and I do not think anyone will say that I do not have some knowledge of the Principality—may be divided into two sections, one honestly against Disestablishment as a principle, and whose views we must all respect, and another section who use the question as a political stalking horse of agitation. I have more respect for the former than I have for the latter. Then again, one of the conspicuous arguments in favour of the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church was that it was an alien church, but this also has been effectively answered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, who said —“We may really speak with as much justice of the Church of Wales in England as of the Church of England in Wales.” Yet these strong assertions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian continue to be absolutely ignored in the speeches we have just heard from the other side to-night, and on every occasion absolutely and unequivocally by the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs and other sin their speeches out of doors. This alien question has become a standing word in the Radical vocabulary as applicable to other interests, but they are not the best friends of Wales, who, in advo-

cating the Disestablishment of the Church, ignored the English population, who were more and more attracted to the Principality, and contributed to our prosperity and our interest. No part of this country is more loyal, I venture to say, than the Principality of Wales, yet this alien question is carried beyond the limits of anything like Welsh nationality. I will give an illustration of the way in which the alien policy is used. When the touching letter of Her Majesty thanking her people for the sympathy given to her on the death of the Duke of Clarence, the newspaper with which the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs is closely connected—which indeed is known practically as his newspaper—had no better commentary to offer on that letter of the Queen than to say—

“that Wales does not waste any love on Royalty;” and speaking of the Royal Family added:—

“If they were swept back again to their own German Fatherland they never would be missed. Wales is intensely Republican.”

Happily such words have no echo in the heart of the large majority of the Welsh people, but are confined to a small section, and that section those who put forward this alien policy as against the Church. The founders of Methodism in Wales, to whom reference has been made, always spoke well of the Church, and deprecated any schism. As to proselytism, a member of any denomination is only performing his duty in endeavouring, by proper means, to attach others to his Church; and if that be so, I hope the Church in Wales will continue to be a proselytising Church. But when the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs spoke of it as proselytising by means of the pewter pot, I think that is an insult to the whole Nonconformist body which they must resent. Out of doors hon. Members use language which is anything but temperate, and on occasions extravagant and violent. By so doing, they provoke a temporary cheer, but revolt the good feeling of both Churchmen and Nonconformists. I have extracts here from Welsh

newspapers which indicate that the sense of the country is strongly against these violent declarations of the organs of the opposite Party. There is no reason why we should not import some spirit of Christian unity and charity into the discussion of a measure so important as this. I must notice the absence of any reference to Disendowment in the Resolution before the House. Disendowment is the fascinating allurements dangled before the people of Wales by hon. Members responsible for this Resolution, yet it is not uttered in this House when, from time to time, Resolutions of this character are brought forward. In Wales that was felt to be the most important consideration, and the principle of Disestablishment was to a great extent thrown aside for it. I am of opinion that we should arrive at a better understanding of this question if it came before the House in the shape of a Bill which, by its details, would show us what was really meant. Not a few Members opposite are opposed to Disestablishment for England. They at least should give their votes against Disestablishment in Wales, for Welsh Disestablishment is avowedly used outside the House with a view to promoting the Disestablishment of the Church in England. However much we may differ upon this subject, there surely should be a way of discussing it in a serious and Christian-like spirit, and trust that the question will be discussed on its merits, and that the real significance of this Resolution will not be misunderstood by hon. Gentlemen who say they are opposed to Disestablishment.

(7.15.) MR. A. J. WILLIAM (Glamorgan, S.): I wish to point out that the Church of England in Wales has failed, in the terms of the Resolution, to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people. The Solicitor General and most of the speakers on the other side seem to have relied for most of their argument against the Resolution upon a recently published article upon what was called the “Phenomenal Advance” which the Church had made in Wales during the last 20 years. It appears that between the years 1841 and 1886, it

*Sir J. Puleston*

the Diocese of St. David's alone, non-resident incumbents were reduced from 74 to 7; in the Diocese of Llandaff from 137 to 5; and it is adduced as an argument to show that the Church of England has made an attempt to do its duty in recent years, that in 1841 there were 174 incumbents in one diocese in Wales who were not Welsh-speaking. It is quite true that great changes have been made, for since 1864 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty have contributed £200,000 towards this work of propagandism in Wales, and all this effort has been directed, with unflinching energy and persistency, to the desperate attempt of propping up the Church in Wales. I do not dispute that the Church by a voluntary effort has done a great deal, and we take it as an axiom that, in proportion to the extent to which a religious body is supported by voluntary effort, it flourishes in its spiritual life. To that extent, I admit there has been a remarkable growth in the Church of England in Wales, but where has it been displayed? The Solicitor General produced statistics with reference to East Wales, and we know that there has been since 1871 an immense increase of population in Glamorganshire, but those people come from England, Scotland, and Ireland, and have brought their religion with them. They are not Welshmen, and naturally the "phenomenal advance" of the Church in Wales has been its growth in our large towns. But if you go to Cardiff, and spend a week there, or go 16 or 17 miles into the Rhondda District, you will find that the overwhelming majority of the Welsh colliers are not only Welsh-speaking but Nonconformist. As to the new churches which have been built, the Dean of Bangor at the Church Congress at Swansea said he did not rely upon figures, but upon the experience of Welsh clergymen, when he said that many of the churches were empty, and five-sixths of the Welsh-speaking nation were outside the Church. It is conclusively shown that all the efforts of the wealthy and all the influence of social position have been brought to bear to increase the number of churches for the benefit of Englishmen, and that they have not

benefited the Welsh people at all. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the saddest part of this long struggle is the bitterness, the class jealousy and hostility, and the feeling of social inequality and injustice, which have been brought about by the continued existence of an Established Church which is the Church of a small ascendant minority. Those small shopkeepers, peasants, and farmers who have built their chapels, and raised £400,000 a year to keep up, very inadequately, the worship after their heart and conscience, see all the wealth, all the social influence used in in favour of this small Church, which is alien in the sense that it is the Church of those who are foreign to the nationality to which we belong. A constant sense of injustice is stamped in the hearts of the Welsh people by seeing this endowed Church supported out of what we maintain is the property of the people. The social disadvantages I will show by an illustration. A farmer's son, who might be a dull and stupid peasant, with just enough in his head to be ordained, directly he becomes a curate, is immediately recognised by the county squire and all the county gentry, and is taken on to a social footing with them all. On the other hand, you may have one of the ablest young men in Wales, who may proceed from an elementary school to the University College and be ordained as a Congregationalist or Baptist, and though he be the brother or cousin of the farmer's son, he would not receive the same social recognition. We want to get rid of this injustice, and to put every religious body in our country on one common footing, without privilege. But I deprecate the suggestion from that side, that in carrying on this great crusade we are actuated by any feelings of bitterness or hostility or dislike to the Established Church. Nothing would be a greater blessing to that Church in Wales than that this great measure of justice should be carried out. If the advice of my hon. Friend is acted on at once, something may be done; but whatever is done by the other side, in a few short months this great question will come to a final issue. We know what the expressed wish of the great majority of the Welsh people, as expressed by their represen-



tatives in this House, is, and that cannot and will not be much longer disregarded by the people of England, when once more we have an opportunity of appealing to them, and this great injustice will be done away. In the meantime it is a great trial, but it has done great things for the Welsh people. It has made us feel first of all that we are a people; it has drawn out all our best qualities; it has made us men; it has created in us a sense of justice, and it has brought home to us the conviction that a great people with great religious instincts have a right to choose their own form of worship.

(7.35.) Mr. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down says that the great mass of the Welsh people are outside the Established Church. But even if the statistics be true, has he shown that their happiness or prosperity will be in the least degree promoted by the passing of this Resolution? He has given us an illustration of the different social treatment of the curate of the Established Church and the minister of a Nonconformist body. How would Disestablishment cure that? If you were to carry it to-morrow you would still have the tithes, bishops, archdeacons, and so on, as you have to-day, and in the same way the English people would form their congregations, and there would still be that sense of social inequality of which you complain, and all that bitterness of feeling which is excited by the fact that the Church of England curate is on good terms with the squire. I think that feeling is fomented by Motions of this kind, which are not directed to any practical good. We know that the property of the Church and charities have been dealt with for a long time by Queen Ann's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the Charity Commissioners, and, therefore, I ask what good will be done to any human being by the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church in Wales? I do not mean merely material good, but what spiritual or social or moral good do you expect from such a Motion as this. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Middleton is apparently

not inclined to answer this question. In a letter to-day we learn that he was never in better health and spirits; but we do not find in that letter, what we usually find in such letters, any reasoning as to the utility of this Motion. In what he said at Newcastle we find not one word as to the policy or justice of this measure. He did not venture to say that any good would accrue from Disestablishment; all he has ever said is that a majority, he finds, of the Welsh people ask this, and what a majority asks it is prudent for politicians to give. That is all we can find from the Newcastle programme to the letter of this morning; that is all the encouragement hon. Members opposite get from their leader. We have heard to-day that the Established Church in Wales is forced on the majority of Nonconformists. In what sense is it forced upon them? In what sense is it an impediment to their worship or injurious to them? They are not compelled to contribute to it, nor to go within its walls. They are never attacked by it. I assert that no clergyman of the Church of England ever uses language about the Nonconformists of the same nature as they use about the Church of England. Disendowment is, I suppose, included in Disestablishment, the latter being a greater kind of word and less likely to alarm the people of England; and no doubt the principal object is Disendowment. The revenues of the Established Church in Wales are not sufficient for its purposes. It is an active and energetic Church, and is undoubtedly doing much good work there. The hon. Gentleman made a mistake when he said that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had devoted large sums to church building; they have no power to appropriate a single shilling to such an object. The church building has been brought about solely by the zeal and contributions of the members of the Church themselves. On what grounds, then, do you desire to abolish the ministers and deprive them of that property which is sufficient for their purposes? Is it the tithe? It might have been argued at one time that tithe was of the nature of a tax, but the position of hon. Members opposite has been that tithe is

Mr. A. J. Williams

property, and nothing else. They desire have that devoted to some secular national purpose. When the hon. member for Midlothian Disestablished the Irish Church the foundation of his scheme was that tithe as property, and it was so treated. If he had treated it in any other way he would have had to omit it, and it would have benefited very much that landed class who were little in favour of it then as they are now. Is it the buildings you want? It seems to me that the ancient Welsh churches have been restored at great cost, and new ones built by the voluntary efforts of the Churchmen in Wales. Do you propose to take them? If they are not proposed to be taken, what does disendowment mean except taking away the tithe, which is property used by a large body in Wales, and insufficient for its purposes. Then we get to disestablishment. There is a disadvantage in a motion of this kind, that it does not state exactly what it means. Arguments have been used as if Establishment meant what it did 100 years ago in this country, and what it means to-day in Spain, Russia, and other continental countries. But surely not. Members must not forget that disestablishment in that sense no longer exists? For two or three generations has been, in a sense, going; we have had the opening of cemeteries, the abolition of Church rates, and other steps have been taken to remove the sense of inequality and injustice which everybody felt. There is a tendency in the Members opposite, and those who speak on behalf of Nonconformists, to forget the enormous advantages they enjoy. They are apt to forget their own property. The Nonconformist bodies themselves have received the benefit of semi-Establishment. Their chapels are freed from rates and taxes, their charities are also free to be settled or ever. They have other privileges than the exemptions of ministers, and so on. If hon. Members want to know how important these privileges are, let them look at France and other countries on the Continent, and see whether the Churches there would not be pleased and proud to have the rights which are granted to Nonconformists

in England and Wales. You have exactly the same rights with regard to your schools as the Church of England has in respect of the education and fee grant. It is put as a great injustice that the Church of England has built more schools than the Nonconformists. That was done by the voluntary contributions of the Church people. There is no fund and no tithe available for the building of schools, and if it be true that education in Wales is monopolised by the Church of England, what does it mean but that the Church people, by their voluntary exertions, have spread a network of schools over Wales; and, if so, that is a great argument in favour of the work and power of that Church in Wales? I really fail to see any good that would be done if the Motion were carried. The Nonconformists would not advance one step towards that social equality—of the want of which you complain, but which laws and statesmen are powerless to give you. The Episcopal Church of Scotland, which has no connection with the State, has all these social advantages, and that sort of respectability and concert with the nobility which so many Nonconformists seem to envy. If a Nonconformist by his ability and good conduct can win a position anywhere he will secure as much respect as any Vicar of the Church of England. We do not want to take away your Church; we do not want to take away your property and apply it to the purposes of our own Church. You say that you want this Disestablishment in order to satisfy the national sentiments of the Welsh race. This is the sort of fictitious idea, the sort of fantastic idea, that seems to have been encouraged in recent years. We have all heard and know of the different influences which operate upon the history of races. We find in Mr. Buckle's *History of Civilization*, the differences which time and habit produce in the temper and character of a race. What I call a real difference of race is such a difference as that which exists between people like the Chinese or the Negro and the people of Italy and Sweden; but I think that the difference of race which is spoken of as to Welshmen is absurdly fictitious. I can find in

London no difference whatever, either in sentiments or in talents, between the Englishman and the Welshmen, and "Mr. Smith" and "Mr. Brown" are equal in all respects, and in all respects equally treated. The Welshman in London speaks English with equal purity to the Englishman; he speaks it with a purity that we in London might even imitate. We do not sit here as representatives of nationalities. I would remind hon. Members who talk about the opinion of Welsh Members; we sit here by constituencies, and I refuse to recognise any such body as the Welsh nation, or Welsh Members at all. I know what you mean by such terms as "the Member for Glamorganshire" or "the Member for Lancashire"; but I do not understand what you mean, except in a social sense, by "the Welsh Members," or "the Cornish Members."

An hon. MEMBER: What about Irish Members?

MR. ADDISON: There comes in a difference. The Welsh Members sit together with the view of giving rise to the belief that there is a sort of Welsh Party. When the Irish Members, who sit behind them, begin to speak, we feel there is a sort of change coming over the House—a sort of sense of relief. There is something about the gentlemen from Ireland that excites interest, and gives rise to cheers, though we do not agree with them; but I confess I am unable to establish or to recognise any difference between the Welsh Members even who sit opposite and the other Members of the House, and I must certainly demur to the notion that there is any difference whatever either in their ideas, or appearance, or manner, or language. I recognise no difference between the Welsh people and the English nation, to which they belong. It is, after all, a very serious and unfortunate movement, and the reason I dislike it is this: that it is an attempt to sow bitterness and bad feeling where it ought not to exist. Why should any minister or Nonconformist have any feeling whatever in regard to the Church of England except a feeling of friendliness, especially when it is not doing him any harm, and does not interfere with him in the work which he is

*Mr. Addison*

doing in connection with his own Church? The Nonconformist would seem to have this sort of feeling in regard to the Church of England made evident when he gets upon a platform; then the bad spirit comes at once to be realised. I hope that hon. Members from Wales will be able to come to the conclusion that neither Disendowment nor Disestablishment would do any good to them nor to anybody else. I do hope they will not give way to these notions of a separate nationality, which, I am glad to say, no one in England adopts. The Welshman with us is able to assert his rights just as is a native of Lancashire, and he is treated by Englishmen as an Englishman is treated. I hope hon. Members will not dwell upon this separate national sentiment, which is more calculated than anything else to disturb that peace which ensures the prosperity of the nation.

\*(8.40.) COLONEL W. CORNWALLIS-WEST (Denbigh, W.): I noticed that my hon. Friend the Member for Devonport, who has just spoken, remarked that the question of Disendowment had not been brought before the House on former occasions. There were murmurs of dissent on this side of the House, but I confess that the remarks that have been made have very real force. I am one of those members of the Church of England in Wales who long—for the last few years, at any rate—have supported the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church; and I, and those I have associated with, have supported the Disestablishment of the Church, in the hope that some means might be found to put a stop to the state of social warfare which has been going on in Wales for a considerable time. At the same time, we acknowledged there were immense difficulties in the way; but it was hoped that by moderation these difficulties might have been overcome. In 1885 I certainly, in common with a great many others, pledged myself to vote for the Disestablishment of the Church; but I entirely agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Devonport and others who have addressed the House this evening that, at that time, and in the past few years, especially in the Resolutions brought be-

this House, the question of the Dis-  
owment of the Church has been kept  
irely in the background. I am going  
show, if the House will bear with  
for a short while, why it is that I  
ee with the hon. Members on this  
ject. Before I do so, I wish to  
e that in all the speeches which  
ave heard there has been simply a  
for equal justice as between Non-  
formists and Churchmen. The hon.  
mber for Mèrthyr said last year,  
that the Welsh Dissenting Body  
for is that those who differ from  
m in externals should have no  
ilege." Well, I entirely agree  
h any protest of that sort. I  
fess I cannot follow the hon.  
mber for Glamorganshire with  
rence to the social distinction made  
ween young clergymen of Lampeter  
young Dissenting ministers from  
Welsh College; because I have  
ociated and, I am happy to say, I  
e friends amongst those who are not  
clergymen of the Church of  
land, but ministers of other deno-  
ations; they come to my house, and  
I always glad to see them. I do not  
gnise any of these social dis-  
inctions; and I do not believe in  
ing reflections upon gentlemen  
ated in one college and gentle-  
educated in another. But my  
Friend the Member for Mont-  
eryshire, who was at one time and,  
as I know, still is the Leader, as  
s called, of the Welsh Party,  
last year—

We are not covetous of the goods of the  
ch. All that we ask for is honourable  
lity before the law for all denomina-

1, that equality before the law I  
e always striven for, and shall  
ays do so; and if Disestablishment—  
is to say, the severance of the  
rch in Wales from the State—can  
g about that equality before the  
all I can say is that there are  
erous gentlemen like myself who  
be very ready to see it carried

But I am sorry to say that that  
ot in the least what is asked for  
. At one time the Members  
Wales and my hon. Friend the  
mber for Montgomeryshire refused  
sociate their cause with the Libera-  
Society. But we are told dis-

tinctly now that the Disestablishment  
and the Disendowment of the Church  
in Wales is in sympathy with the  
Liberation Society in England, and is  
the first object of the attack on the  
total Disestablishment of the English  
Church. Well, I say, as a member of  
the Church of England, when I  
am told that fact I draw back and  
say—this is not what I intended at all;  
everybody must concede that in Wales  
the Dissenting community are in a  
large majority; but, at the same time,  
I will say that the minority have in all  
these Debates been treated as if they  
were merely a minority hardly worth  
consideration. It is a very remarkable  
fact—and this has not been stated this  
evening—that at the Election of 1885  
the number of those who voted for Dis-  
establishment was 98,593; and those  
who voted against it were 67,560,  
which is showing a ratio of 3 to 2.  
Well, that is a fact which I confess I  
consider ought to have some weight  
when you come to deal with the interest  
and the property of the minority. We  
know from the very highest source that  
the English Church in Wales or the  
Welsh Church in Wales is in a very  
flourishing condition. The right hon.  
Gentleman the Member for Midlothian  
tells us that—

"Undoubtedly the Established Church in  
Wales is an advancing Church, an active  
Church, a living Church, and I hope very dis-  
tinctly a rising Church from elevation to ele-  
vation."

This is also a remarkable fact. In the  
Welsh *National Quarterly* of last July  
I find this:—

"The Rev. T. Lewis Jones, a Methodist  
minister and Cambridge Prizeman on the staff  
of the North Wales University College,  
referring to this subject set down for the  
Church Congress, observed 'every honest  
Nonconformist will acknowledge that a great  
reformation has taken place within the  
Established Church in Wales during recent  
years, and that the Church, especially in the  
towns, is gaining ground. The best class of  
Nonconformist were quite prepared to agree  
with all that Churchmen say touching the  
revival that exists among them. I say again  
it would be dishonest on our part, as Non-  
conformists, to attempt to deny the progress  
that goes on within the Church these days.  
A new generation of clergy are able to  
enter into the life of the nation better than  
their predecessors. They sympathise with the  
aspirations of Wales in many directions,  
and strive their best to drink of the spirit of  
young Wales.'"

I allude to this opinion of a Nonconformist minister in the hope that, at any rate, it may lead people to suppose that the Church of England in Wales is deserving of some consideration. It is impossible to ignore the fact that the minority of Churchmen in Wales is not only a powerful one, a numerous one, an increasing one, but also at the present moment that the Church is thriving, and, whether disestablished or not, will in all probability in 25 years become much more powerful. There are abuses in the Church which we acknowledge; but on the other hand, unfortunately, when these matters are brought before this House for reform, instead of lending us a helping hand, we are obstructed and opposed, and we are told not to come here for reform. I want to point out to the House what is actually the idea brought before the population of Wales at the present moment with regard to the disendowment of the Church. In November, 1890, in the *Carnarvon Herald*, which is a very well-known newspaper and a newspaper which carries a great deal of weight, and I must say, generally speaking, extremely well conducted, this newspaper published a draft Bill. Who drafted the Bill I cannot say. Possibly it may have been drafted by the hon. Member for Carnarvon. I want to point out what were the provisions of this Bill, which was lauded to the skies afterwards, which was criticised by distinguished Nonconformists, and which was called extremely moderate. First of all there was to be a Commission—one Commissioner appointed by the President of the Local Government Board, and one by each of the County and Borough Councils in Wales, making a body of 14. The County Councils, I wish to point out, are very largely composed of Nonconformists, so that the whole of these Commissioners would be Nonconformists; with the exception, possibly, of the one who would be appointed by the President of the Local Government Board. This body was to be called the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Wales. Each of these Commissioners was to be paid £50 a

year. They should have full powers to call witnesses and enforce attendance, and to punish anybody who refused. All the property of the Church, and all in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, besides all in any way belonging or appertaining to any Bishop or Cathedral, was to be vested in that body. All Clerical and Cathedral Corporations in Wales were to be dissolved; all ecclesiastical laws were to cease; the Bishops and clergy were to be paid annuities for life; £25 was to be paid to curates not permanently appointed; compensation was to be made for private patronage. The Church was to be called upon to form itself into a body, to be called the Representative Body, and was to consist of Bishops, clergy, and laity. Well, I now come to the use that this Commission was to be put to. The principal clause is this—

"If any church or chapel be in actual use at the time of the passing of this Act, and if such church or chapel shall have been erected at least 50 years before the passing of this Act; and if the Representative Body shall within six months of the passing of this Act apply to the Commissioners for the use of such church or chapel, the Commissioners may let such church or chapel to the Representative Body on such terms as the Commissioners may fix, provided always that if the Representative Body shall omit to apply to the Commissioners for the use of any such church or chapel as above provided, or shall refuse or neglect to accept the terms fixed by the Commissioners, it shall be lawful for the Commissioners to let any such church or chapel for the purpose of Divine worship, and for no other purpose whatsoever, to any person or persons who shall accept the terms offered by the Commissioners. The Commissioners shall, on the application of the Representative Body, if made within twelve months of the passing of this Act, vest in that body all ecclesiastical residences with garden and curtilage thereto, also all glebe lands, subject to any existing life interests, upon payment to the Commissioners twenty times the amount of the annual value of such ecclesiastical residence and glebe lands."

Now, Sir, it is quite time to hear from these gentlemen some statement as to what they are going to ask Parliament to do. I certainly hope they will repudiate this Draft Bill, and that they will most distinctly point out how far the confiscation of the property of the Church is to go. I have seen announced in a newspaper that the Church is to be stripped of the last rag

Colonel W. Cornwallis-West

on her back. As regards the disposal of the money, first, it is proposed that the money should be applied to education; but education is already provided for in every possible way—higher, middle-class, and elementary. Then it is proposed that professional chairs should be endowed; that a national Academy of Art and Science should be established, and museums erected; that the Eisteddfod should be assisted, and that one or two astronomical observatories should be erected in the Principality. These, we are told, will be the uses to which the money realised from the property of the Church will be put. I can only say that I hope my colleague the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Glamorgan will repudiate the scheme which the *Carnarvon Herald*, and which gave great shock to those people in Wales who were in favour of a moderate scheme of Disestablishment. So far as I am personally concerned, I regret I am obliged to say this much. I agree that there is a desire on the part of the Welsh people for what they call religious equality; and if that equality can be attained by Disestablishment, without the predatory means and measures as those which are suggested, I, for one, will continue to support it. But unless we get an assurance that the Church property is not to be confiscated, and the churches which we have built and adorned at enormous cost are held sacred, we will have nothing whatever to do with demands so unjust and iniquitous.

(9.5.) MR. G. T. KENYON (Denbigh): I hope that the modified state of the opinions of my hon. Friend opposite have so permeated those with whom it is his good fortune to act that he shall have the benefit of his vote on this occasion. The hon. Gentleman opposite, the Member for Flintshire, says, and it is practically the preamble of his Resolution, that the Welsh Church has failed in the objects for which it was established, and it is for that reason he advocates Disestablishment. Well, Sir, we have heard that a great many Members are edged, more especially Members on the other side—Members of the Principality—to the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church. But, Sir, I do think that

on an occasion of this sort we were entitled to hear the united voice of Radical Wales on the subject. At any rate, we might have had the so-called Leader of the Welsh Radical Party present on this occasion. I know that he has written from Valescure to say that he trusts the Welsh people will be satisfied with the fact that he is taking care of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian. Nobody wishes better to the Member for Midlothian than I do. I wish him long life. Being a citizen and a denizen of the same county, I am a great admirer of the right hon. Gentleman; but I do not see why the Welsh Radical Leader should be his caretaker. I should have thought the Member for Midlothian was quite capable of taking care of himself. Now, it is said in this Resolution that the Welsh Church has failed in its mission, and ought, therefore, to be disestablished. The Resolution seems to me to convey two alternatives, one of which the hon. Member for Flintshire must accept. One alternative is that the hon. Gentleman who proposed this Motion is in a great hurry to pledge the House to this Resolution, presumably because he is afraid that if the House does not now sanction it that some other and more pressing question, dealing, perhaps, with affairs in Ireland may take precedence in the coming election. My hon. Friend the Member for Flintshire says we must have Disestablishment first and Home Rule afterwards, but if he appeals to some of his friends on the Irish Benches, they will no doubt say we must have Home Rule first and Disestablishment afterwards. That is one alternative. The other alternative is that my hon. Friend is greatly afraid of the progress the Church of England is making in the Principality; and he thinks that if he cannot get this Resolution passed in this House now, he may find it does not occupy the same favourable position hereafter as it does today. Which alternative does the hon. Member accept? Now, what I want to know is whether this is an election cry or a *bonâ fide* declaration that the Church is not at the present moment fulfilling its duties as I believe it is. There has been a great deal of talk about statistics. I am not very

fond of statistics, and I do not believe that this question is going to be settled by statistics. You say the Church does not meet the wants of the people. I venture to say this: the Church of England in Wales cannot be measured by mere statistics; it must be measured by the comfort it has brought to numberless homes in trouble and necessities; in all those things, and on all those occasions in which we look up to religion to guide us. I cannot consent to defend the Church on the ground mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) in a recent letter. That was said to be a very good electioneering letter; from my own knowledge it was an extremely bad one. I would not go to a Nonconformist meeting and say to the people there that they ought to vote for me on the ground that Home Rule would be brought nearer; though the Member for West Birmingham said in the letter which was read at a Conservative meeting that by voting for a Conservative Government Disestablishment would be brought nearer than it would be brought by voting for a Liberal Member. That is not my view. How that letter ever came to be read out at a Conservative meeting is beyond my ken and my comprehension. While I cannot surrender the position of our Church, I grant to all Nonconformist Bodies, in the freest and fullest and the humblest spirit, that they, too, are working along one straight high road which I trust will lead us all to the triumph of religion against infidelity.

(9.38.) MR. LLOYD - GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I do not propose to characterise the genial speech of the hon. Member for the Denbigh Boroughs, who has just sat down, with that epithet which he seemed to apprehend so much from these Benches. We all appreciate his position, and the straightforwardness with which he has expressed his views, which are certainly not popular in his constituency. But it is with a totally different spirit that we must approach the speech of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire (Colonel Cornwallis-West.) He has told us that though he has voted time

after time in favour of the Motion for Disestablishment in Wales, he all along was opposed to any measure for Disendowment. The House can draw its own inference with regard to that admission, when I say it comes contemporaneously with the announcement that the hon. Gentleman does not propose to go for re-election in that constituency. Of this I am quite positive, that the hon. Gentleman was certainly understood by every supporter in that constituency to say he was prepared to vote for Disendowment as well as Disestablishment, and if the hon. Gentleman does not understand that, he displays a woful amount of ignorance of the views of his chief supporters in that constituency. There is one thing that I have observed in the speeches of hon. and right hon. Members who have supported Establishment in Wales and that is: that though they challenge our statistics, and tell us the Church is making progress, not once have they given us a single figure upon which we could base an estimate of the progress of the Church. Our own figures have been challenged. The Solicitor General, in his exceedingly able and eloquent speech, told us that the Nonconformist denominations publish annual reports, showing the state of their membership, and it is remarkable that though the Nonconformists publish annual statements showing the number of their adherents for public inspection and correction, the Church has not yet thought proper to publish statistics in regard to her condition in Wales. But the Solicitor General challenged us with regard to the census taken by Mr. Gee, a very distinguished journalist and a Liberal leader in Wales. He undertook a census of the attendance at all places of worship in Wales, both Church and Nonconformist. We have been challenged by hon. Members opposite about that census, and I assume therefore, that it is not a census that they consider to be unfavourable to their position. I propose to produce the figures which were obtained by that census, and this is the result. Throughout the whole of North Wales, the aggregate attendance at all the services of the Church of England amounted to

*Mr. G. T. Kenyon*

ing like one-fifth of the aggregate attendance at all places of worship. In South Wales, the attendance at Church services amounted to one-sixth of what it was at all places of worship. The aggregate attendance at Church Sunday schools in South Wales amounted to one-sixth of all Sunday schools throughout the Principality, and the proportion was one-eighth. I should like to put it out to the House the method which the Church went about in getting up an attendance for this particular Sunday. Mr. Gee announced that he proposed on a certain Sunday to estimate the attendance at the whole of the churches and chapels throughout the Principality. The Church of Wales used every subterfuge and—I am sorry to use the phrase, but it is the fact—in order to fill its churches. This sort of thing was done. Those who attended the Welsh service were counted for the English service, and those who attended the English came to the Welsh services. Another dodge that was done was this. Where it happened to be three or four churches in any particular town, those who attended the service in one church were first counted, ran off to the next church, and so on. (Laughter from the Ministerial Benches.) If I am allowed, I can give the very town in which that occurred, and I shall do so. The congregation of a certain church in Aberystwyth, a Cathedral city, having first been counted in the church ran off to the Cathedral and were counted over. These are really dodges. But this was really done in order to get up the attendance and to create an artificial attendance at the churches on that Sunday. Notwithstanding that fact, the Church simply stated that she possessed at the very end of the last year only one-tenth of the whole population of the Principality. A reference was made to the second census by Owen Owen, but though the Lord General has been good enough to refer to the first letter in the *Times*, he did not allude to the second, and so this difference. The first letter was a census of all the towns as well as of the rural districts. That is a very important distinction. In the towns where the Church is prosperous

—but that is simply an argument in favour of the voluntary system—the churches are built by voluntary contributions, and are maintained by the contributions of their members and not by tithes. There could not possibly be a stronger argument in favour of our contention. But the point is this. What is the attendance in these rural districts where the Church is most in need of evidence, where the Church has to rely mainly on the endowments that belong to the nation? The second census throws a considerable light upon that question. A census was taken of the attendance in something like 78 parishes, rural districts in North Wales, and it was discovered that the attendance at any one service throughout the whole of these parishes came to something like 5 to 5½ per cent. of the whole population. I noticed that some of these results were challenged after they were published, and I took the trouble, in these cases, to discover what was the effect of those corrections. In most instances the clergymen who challenged the census contented themselves with saying it was incorrect, but in some of the instances in which the clergymen gave their own figures, we could verify the results, with the outcome that even deducting the figures given by the clergymen themselves, the attendance in the particular towns where the figures were given came to 15 per cent. of the population, and in the rural districts to 6 per cent. of the population. I can give to the House one or two examples of the way in which the Church of England operates in the rural districts of Wales. Not very long ago some Hussars were sent down to collect tithe in a small mountain parish in Flintshire called Llanelltydy. On the Sunday morning after the visit a census was taken of the attendance at the church in that parish, and though there were 900 people in the parish, the attendance at that church was only seven, yet the people of Llanelltydy were to be dragooned in order to maintain the religion of something under 1 per cent. of the population of that parish. I could show an instance of a parish better off, where, however, there was a still smaller minority of the population



belonging to the Church. Lately the Bishop of St. Asaph, on a Sunday, visited one of the parishes in his diocese. The service was timed in such a way as to allow the members of the Nonconformist chapels to attend if they desired. A good many availed themselves of the opportunity, but the whole congregation, the majority of which was constituted of the members of the contiguous Nonconformist chapels, only amounted to 32; and, in the afternoon, so disastrous was the Bishop's oratory on the congregation, that only 12 attended, and there was no service in the evening. Another instance. Some time during last winter, I think in the Cathedral Church of St. Asaph itself, there was a service, there was a choir, there were two or three other officials—I do not know what they are called—and there was a sermon by the Dean, but the whole congregation only numbered three, and those three had the satisfaction of going home knowing that £30 had been spent for each of them in the service of religion. The condition of things is better in the towns, but that is, after all, simply a proof that the Establishment as such is ruinous to the prospects of the Church in Wales, and that where the Church simply depends on voluntary effort and contributions, there the Church succeeds. We have been told by hon. Members on the other side of the House that the Church is making considerable progress. But it has not been suggested that she is likely to make sufficient progress to convert her minority into a majority.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I believe an hon. Member says "Yes." Here we have a Nonconformist population. Is it likely that a Nonconformist country is going to abandon her creed for the sake of another? Is there a case on record of a country abandoning its creed until that creed became utterly decayed and worthless? Are there any signs of the decay of Dissent? On the contrary never did Nonconformity show such signs of prosperity in Wales. During the last 20 years the adherents of Nonconformist denominations have increased by something like 50 per cent.; contributions have increased by 75 per

cent.; and yet we are told that Wales is on the point of abandoning Nonconformity for the sake of the Church of England. There is another point I wish to call attention to, and it is this. Not only is Nonconformity increasing its numbers, but it is increasing in influence. At the present moment all the most powerful preachers of Wales are ministers of the Nonconformist churches, and really, with the exception of one notable instance, the Church does not possess a single great preacher in the Principality. Nonconformity is interwoven with every fibre of the national existence, and it cannot be eradicated without hopelessly disfiguring the national character. Then what are the means used by the Church in Wales in order to bring about this proselytism? The poor have been plied with alms and the greedy with bribes; the land hunger has been utilised by the preference shown for churchmen as tenants of farms; and society has been open to anybody who could produce a certificate of apostasy; but that sort of thing can never succeed in the country. Eliminate all those whose poverty exceeds their fidelity to the traditions of the Established Church, all those in whom the love of greed exceeds their attachment to their Creed, and still the nation remains; and I say it is absolutely impossible, it is contrary to all precedent and probability that the Church movement can ever succeed in Wales. What are the facts with regard to this Church? Here is a Church that came into Wales with mailed warriors, whose missionaries were the warriors; and it was imposed upon us by the force of arms, and it is at the present moment buttressed up by police truncheons. In the rural districts the Church cannot command more than 5 per cent. of the population, and in the towns it cannot command more than 15 per cent. of the population; and yet this is called the National Church of Wales. It is high time, in the interests of the Church itself, that it should be rescued from such a false position. An hon. Member on the other side of the House told us that this is an agitation which has cropped up within the last three years, and that it would soon pass by. On the contrary, in Wales it is an old struggle. Cen-

*Mr. Lloyd-George*

ries ago Welshmen claimed religious independence and freedom. Their stition was treated as treason, and they were executed as rebels. This is a great fact in Welsh history, and when I am told this is simply an agitation of to-day, I answer by saying "No; it is an agitation which has been going on for generation after generation in Wales." Several attempts have been made to force us into acceptance of this Church. The last resort was the passing of the 15th Act; but if Welshmen are not to be terrified by the sword of excommunication, are they going to be abduced by County Court summonses? appeal to Englishmen for the sake of the dignity of their Church, for the sake of the honour of their country, to concede to us this small measure of right which we have so long demanded in Wales.

(9.50.) MR. BYRON REED (Bradford, E.): I think the House will give the hon. Member who has just sat down credit for the boldness he has manifested this evening in reviewing so long since defunct religious census Mr. Gee. A word or two of explanation as to who and what is Mr. Gee may perhaps be of interest to the House. Mr. Gee is a very estimable gentleman, who combines in his own person multifarious occupations amongst them, I believe, that of teacher, County Councillor, newspaper proprietor, and editor, and generally the chief priest of the Liberation Society in North Wales. Some years ago, Mr. Gee, being not only an enthusiastic Liberationist, but also a very ardent practical journalist, undertook to gather for publication in the columns of his paper, an unofficial amateur census of the attendances at certain churches and chapels on a certain day; and he undertook by the results of that enumeration to prove the Church to be in a pitiable minority in Wales, and Nonconformity in a superior position. He chose his own lay and his own enumerators; and the mode of enumeration adopted was entirely his own; and whereas very full and sufficient notice was given to those religious bodies who are supposed to be friendly to Mr. Gee's views, in a great many cases no notice whatever

was given to the clergy or church-going people. By such a census as that no reasonable body of people would expect to be bound. Yet it is only in the most casual and fragmentary fashion that we have been able to secure Mr. Gee's returns, which, for the most part, remain in the pigeon-holes of Mr. Gee's office at Denbigh. We church people, while very properly declining to be bound by an unofficial amateur census of this kind, are quite prepared to submit the immediate matter before us to the arbitrament of a fair and impartial census taken, not by partisans for political purposes, but by cool, impartial officials whose business it is to arrive at conclusions without reference to this party or that. But it is notorious that any proposals of that kind are always strenuously opposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The year before last, when the Census Bill was passing through Committee of this House, an hon. Member made an attempt to secure the insertion of a clause which would provide for a religious census in England and Wales. A number of Gentlemen on this side went into the Lobby with the hon. Member, but hon. Members opposite repudiated any such proposal and thus furnished one more illustration of the unwillingness of their Party to submit these matters to the arbitrament of an official census. The hon. Member for Carnarvon asked whether it was likely that the Nonconformists of Wales would abandon their own Creed and come over to what, I suppose, he would describe as an "alien Church?" My answer to that is, in the first place, whether the hon. Member and his friends like it or not, admit it they must, that of late years there has been a steadily increasing leakage from Nonconformity to the National Church. (Opposition cries of "No, no.") Hon. Members may murmur, but those murmurs do not alter the steady flow towards the Church in Wales. That flow is attested by the Confirmation returns, and by the various other records and statistics which the Bishops and other officials in Wales have at hand; and I confess I could wish for nothing better than that this steady flow, which has been very much larger

in Wales than in England in proportion to the population, should be continued at the same ratio for another generation, by which time we would be perfectly secure, so far as the Church in Wales is concerned; by which time the representation of Wales would be changed in this House; and the predominance of the Church would be unquestioned. Then it is asked if the Nonconformists in Wales are likely to abandon their own Creed? But what is the Creed of Welsh Nonconformity? The Creed of the Church of England, I know. The Creed of any Nonconformist body is an unknown quantity, except in so far as Nonconformist bodies have adopted the Creed of the Church of England, and this has been done by the principal Nonconformist body in Wales—the Calvinistic Methodists. If hon. Gentlemen will examine the poll deed of the Calvinistic Methodists, dated 10th August 1826, they will find it is provided that this body was formed by the clergy and laity of the Church; that it is bound to teach and hold all the articles of the Church of England in the Calvinistic sense, and the Apostles' Creed. I now pass on to complain of the constant persistent, unswerving, and unscrupulous misrepresentation to which the Church in Wales is subjected by hon. Members opposite, and by their friends. The hon. Member for Carnarvon made a charge in connection with the recent Church Congress at Rhyl. He made a deliberate charge against the Church Congress Committee that they had made a profit by the sale of intoxicating liquor in the Congress grounds. That charge was entirely unfounded and was made to discredit the Church in Wales. Even when the report was contradicted the hon. Member stuck to his guns and repeated the charge, knowing that if a lie is given 48 hours' start it is a matter of impossibility to overtake it. It was not until the hon. Member was shown that no license was held by the Congress Committee, and that neither directly nor indirectly were the Congress Authorities responsible for the sale of liquors, that he expressed his regret that he had made a mistake.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: At the Rhyl County Court a Member of the

*Mr. Byron Reed*

Church Congress Committee was held to be an agent.

MR. BYRON REED: Does that imply that the hon. Member still makes the charge?

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: Hear, hear.

MR. BYRON REED: I can only meet the charge with a most uncompromising denial. The hon. Member for Merioneth, speaking at Bangor, inaccurately stated the amount received by the clergy from tithes in Wales. The hon. Member has stated the total rent charge was £304,000, but it was only £231,500. Taking the depreciation of the value of tithe property, the whole amount received was only £118,000 a year.

MR. J. ELLIS: My figures were taken from the Tithe Commutation Returns of 1888, and I should like to know where the hon. Member's figures are from?

MR. BYRON REED: I can assure the hon. Gentleman that the figures I have quoted are correct as to the value of tithes in Wales.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: Where are the figures from?

MR. BYRON REED: The sources of information from which I have taken my figures are open to hon. Gentlemen opposite. There is great misrepresentation on this matter, and the grossest and most atrocious mis-statements are made by the Welsh vernacular Press. The head and front of this agitation against the Church in Wales is to be found in the Welsh vernacular Press, which is edited, written, and officered by some Nonconformist preachers of the baser sort. I hold in my hand a translation of some verses which appeared in a Welsh newspaper only last week, and they will show the misrepresentation to which the Church in Wales is subjected by Welsh vernacular journalists.

DR. TANNER: Read the vernacular.

MR. BYRON REED: I am sorry that I cannot oblige the hon. Member. Here lies one of our greatest difficulties in running down these journalistic atrocities, because I am informed by those who have a knowledge of the Welsh language that it is possible

or words in Welsh to convey meanings far more extravagant, extreme, and bitter, than those contained in the English language. To show the extreme bitterness of the Welsh vernacular press towards the Church in Wales, I may state that the following verse is said to be recited in Yorkshire National Schools :—

"I'm not a little Protestant,  
As some would have me say;  
I'm not a little Romanist,  
So call me what you may.  
First to confession I must go,  
To tell out all my shame,  
My list of sins all one by one,  
In penitence must name."

MR. S. EVANS: Would the hon. Member kindly inform the House who the talented translator may be?

MR. BYRON REED: I am not in a position to do that, but I shall be happy if the hon. Member doubts the translation to give him a copy of the original. I can only say that I hold in my hand letters from the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Ripon, and the Bishop of Wakefield, and other representatives of the Episcopal Bench in Yorkshire, together with the Diocesan Inspector, entirely repudiating in the most positive terms that any such verse was ever in use in any of the National Schools of Yorkshire. The whole thing is a mere fabrication, and manufactured for political purposes by the vernacular press of Wales. A population which is led by such leaders and instructed by such teachers is one which needs the pity of every intelligent and right-minded person. In another paper there is the story of how, in a rural parish in Wales, there was a school controlled by the rector and the squire, nine out of every ten of the children attending which were Nonconformists. On one occasion the rector told all the children that all those above a certain age who would learn a certain rhyme would be taken for an outing on a certain date. On that date they were taken out, met a lot more children, and then were taken into a church and Confirmed. The writer, of course, takes the most perfect pains to conceal the identity of this impossible rector, and I have no hesitation in calling it a fabrication from beginning to end; and it is by

such fabrications and downright lying that the cause of Disestablishment is supported. At a certain meeting at the Memorial Hall, London, called the "smock frock farce," where managers, lawyers, schoolmasters, and preachers, masqueraded as agricultural labourers, a certain Mr. Bowen Rowlands, not the hon. Member of this House, said that in a certain case there were five churches close together, and a man went down to take a census of the communicants. There were a number at the first church, and when the man had left they were marched to the next, and so on, so that each of them were, for the purpose of the census, magnified into five communicants. Mr. Rowlands has been asked, again and again, for chapter and verse, but has taken care to maintain an impassive silence, which, under the circumstances, is the best possible thing for the credibility of that gentleman. I need not give more illustrations to show that this agitation against the Church in Wales is a manufactured agitation, born largely of political spite and class animosity, and that the agitation is carried on by the most unworthy weapons of slander, misrepresentation, and downright falsehoods, and I would strongly urge the House not to accept the stories which appear in the newspapers as indicative of the state of things in Wales, for in 95 cases out of 100 they are fabrications, and in the other five they are distortions of actual facts. What good do hon. Gentlemen opposite propose to do the Principality by prolonging the agitation? During this Debate of five hours I have failed to observe the least attempt on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite to give any definition of what they mean by Disestablishment and Disendowment. What kind of Disestablishment do you mean? Such as you had in Ireland? The hon. Member for Carnarvon makes a negative sign at that; he is consistent. At the great meeting at Pontypridd, at which the great Liberal Federation was inaugurated, he said, speaking of the Irish Disestablishment :—

"He would prefer waiting for ten years rather than have such a Bill for Wales. The more agitation they kept up in Wales the better would be the terms of the Disestablishment Bill Parliament would give them."

Many people are deluded into the belief that Disestablishment in England and Wales would mean a repetition of that in Ireland, but those who hold that view will scarcely be prepared for the admission of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that it is a much more drastic measure than they mean. In Ireland the vested interests of the clergy and dignitaries of the Church were respected, and they were permitted to retain possession of their cathedrals and parish churches. Do you propose to go further than that in Wales? Do you propose to disendow or secularise the cathedrals and parish churches? Hon. Gentlemen opposite are very chary about announcing their exact intentions on that point. We know very well that the Radical programme before the General Election of 1885 adopted the scheme of the Liberation Society, which stated that all cathedrals and ancient parish churches in England and Wales should be handed over to Local Boards for absolutely secular purposes or sale. Will you go to the constituencies and tell them that you propose to give to the clergy far harder terms of settlement than in Ireland; that you propose to secularise every stone and timber in their cathedrals and churches? Will right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite thank you for it, and adopt it? Are they, on the eve of a General Election, prepared to repeat the experience of 1885? If you are honest, you will lay frankly before the House what you mean by Disestablishment and Disendowment, and no longer conceal your opinion by soft phrases, and wrap up your desires in smooth generalities. Let us know what proposals we have to fight, then we will fight you—not only on the floor of this House, but in the constituencies; and we wish for no better cry with which to go to the country. I think this must not be separated from the concurrent case of the Church in England. There are not two Churches, but one Church, and that which aims a blow at one aims disaster and danger at the other. As the Church is one in Wales and England, so shall its cause be one in this House, or out of it, and for that reason we on this side,

*Mr. Byron Reed*

with many allies, I hope, on the other side, go into the Division Lobby to vote against the proposal of the hon. Member for Flintshire.

(10.35.) MR. G. O. MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.): I will not follow the hon. Member who has just spoken into the newspaper extracts which he has read to the House, for I cannot possibly believe, admitting that the extracts are strictly accurate, that the claims of a nation to justice ought to be refused because two or three journalists have been guilty of want of taste. I was a little startled at the beginning of the Debate by the uncompromising tone of hostility which the Solicitor General took up, for I could not help thinking of a letter written by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham to my constituents, advising them, if they wanted Disestablishment not to vote for me, but to vote for the Party opposite. I thought some sort of concordat had been arranged between the right hon. Gentleman and the Government to look at this question on somewhat broader lines. Now we have had several remarkable occurrences during this Debate, and perhaps the most remarkable has been the fact that, for the first time for 22 years, a Welsh Conservative Member—there are not many of them—raised his voice in defence of the Church in Wales.

MR. KENYON (Denbigh): I spoke in defence of it in 1885.

MR. G. O. MORGAN: But the most remarkable speech in the Debate was that of the hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne, who denied that there was such a thing as a Welsh nationality. I should have thought the Welsh nationality was by far the most pronounced of the four nationalities into which this kingdom is popularly divided, as we are not only divided geographically, but also by the barrier of language. It is too late now to say there is no such thing as a Welsh nationality. I think we have made good our right to be considered a separate nationality; we have again and again passed Bills dealing with Wales as distinct from England, Scotland, and Ireland. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the

question is narrowed to this: Is the Church of England in Wales the national Church of Wales? A deal of interesting historical light has been thrown on this question. The hon. Member for Carnarvon said it was imposed by conquest on Wales; but on the other side it is said that the Church of St. David is older than that of St. Augustine, and that the Church of England is a descendant of the Church of Wales. But the question is not what the Church was 600 or 800 years ago; but what it is in 1892. Looking simply at the present time, I say without fear of contradiction that it is in more than one sense an alien Church. It ministers chiefly to settlers in the country. It is alien to the tone, temperament and genius of the Welsh people, who are democratic in their religion as in their politics. The despotism of the parson, mild and benevolent as it may be, is intolerable to him. The Welsh are too essentially an emotional people, and the Church of England with its "Popish liturgy and Arminian clergy," to quote the famous words of Lord Chatham, does not appeal to them. No Church is entitled to be called national, in other words, entitled to the support of the State, unless it can fulfil two conditions. Unless it numbers a clear majority of the people amongst its members, and unless it is so bound up with the religious life of the nation that you cannot touch the one without inflicting a serious blow on the other. I will assume that it fulfils these two conditions in England; but will any hon. Gentleman dare to get up and tell me that it fulfils these two conditions in Wales? It is not contended by anybody that it holds the majority of the people in Wales; not even by its staunchest advocate. Lord Selborne himself only put the Church at half the number of the Nonconformists, and the late Dean of Bangor, one of the most devoted of Churchmen, estimated the number of Churchmen among the Welsh-speaking population at one-sixth. The Solicitor General said that the Nonconformists were 49 per cent. of the population; does he mean that the remaining 51 per cent. are Churchmen? The numbers taken by the hon. Gentleman only included those

actually on the roll of adherents; but by far the larger number of Welshmen are Nonconformists, although not formally enrolled. I do not place much confidence in censuses of the kind which have been proposed, for I am inclined to agree with the old saying that "there is nothing so fallacious as figures, except facts." The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down asks why we do not agree to a religious census? Because I cannot conceive a more childish way of ascertaining the religion of a nation than that. The census which has been proposed by the friends of the Church would, in my opinion, have been valueless and unreliable and in the highest degree misleading; but there is another kind of census upon which reliance can be placed, and that is the Ballot Box. Just observe how remarkable is the progress that this question has made since Mr. Watkin Williams brought it under notice 22 years ago. Then it was only supported by 7 members from Wales, including the Mover and Seconder: 13 voted against it, and the others stopped away. But, ever since, the Welsh supporters of this Motion have gone on steadily increasing in number, and now 27 Welsh Members out of 30 are pledged to Disestablishment, and only 3 oppose it. Not only that, but the six bye-elections have shown how this question has developed, and how it has met with the support of the people. Taking the County Councils, at the last election in every county but one the Nonconformists literally swept the boards. Again, out of 17 Welsh papers printed in the vernacular, 15 are devoted to Disestablishment; only 2 belong to the Church defence party, and of these two one, I believe, is on its last legs. Three or four years ago the Bishop of St. Asaph charged a Calvinistic Methodist Deacon with having sanctioned by his presence a gross and foul outrage upon the Church of England—no less than a parody of the rites of the Holy Sacrament. I challenged the Bishop to name the man whom he alluded to, and when his lordship did not do so, I repeated that challenge in this House. The Bishop then wrote to the *Times* a letter in which he said he had in his

possession "seven sworn affidavits" which proved the truth of his assertions. He did not say by whom those affidavits were made, nor did he say where they came from, or where the occurrence took place; he did not name the Magistrate before whom they were sworn, nor did he show how it came to pass that any affidavits chanced to be sworn in a matter in which there was no litigation pending. But he said he had sent them to Lord Selborne who had written him a letter, in which he said, if the affidavits were true, the Bishop was quite justified in making the charge. Now, everybody knows the value of such affidavits made under such circumstances; every man who has spent six weeks in a lawyer's office knows that such affidavits as these are not worth the paper upon which they are written. It has been pointed out that the Church has been making progress exactly in proportion as she leans least upon State aid. At Cardiff, where the whole of the tithes do not amount to much more than £200 a year, the Church is making progress, but everywhere that she leans most upon State aid, the Churches are found to be empty. This matter was put very well by the late Dean of Bangor, when he said that—

"The Church has made material progress of late. Churches, schools, and parsonages have been built, but how many of the churches are empty!"

When we say that the Church is in a minority in Wales, we are only stating half our case, because the Church comprises not only the minority, but by far the richest part of the community and with them also the poorest. It is not the Church of the poor; it is the Church of the pauper, consisting of those who are most able to give, and those who are most anxious to get, and that accounts for some of those conversions of which we have heard. You must remember that the Church offers bishoprics, palaces, deaneries, and many other prizes, whilst the Nonconformist offers nothing but a clear conscience and the privilege of paying for it. In this regard I am reminded of what an author, dear to every Unionist heart, says. Mr. Lecky says—

*Mr. G. O. Morgan*

"Where certain privileges are attached to any form of religion it may make many converts, but it is perfectly certain to make many hypocrites."

With regard to the second point—the bearing of the Church on the religious and moral life of the people—the Home Secretary knows that Wales has not at the present moment, in proportion to its population, half as many criminals as England, and that scarcely a Judge of assize goes there but comments again and again upon the extraordinary absence of crime. There are, it is well recognised, certain crimes of a grave nature which are altogether unknown in Wales. Since I have acted as a Magistrate, I may say that I have never issued a warrant or a summons against a man for assaulting a woman. Now, I say that this marked absence of crime is mainly due to the influence of the Nonconformists. This was over and over again borne out by Lord Aberdare by the testimony of the Welsh clergy themselves. In my own experience, when acting as Chairman of a large Industrial Society, I was told by the manager of that Association that he always preferred, if he could, to employ Nonconformists, because they were more sober, more steady, and more trustworthy. I have always spoken in the highest terms of the Welsh clergy. I believe them to be exceedingly zealous and exceedingly energetic; but I do say this: that they are more occupied in fighting Dissent than in preaching Christianity, and that explains why so many Churchmen believe that the result of Disestablishment would be eminently beneficial to the Church of Wales. If that be so, what are you afraid of in this Motion before this House? You have on your side all the wealth and social influence of the country. I remember seeing in the *Times* the other day a letter signed by 20 of the richest noblemen and gentlemen in England, in which they appealed to their English brethren not to leave the poor Welsh Church to starve by robbing it of the endowments. If these 20 noblemen and gentlemen had put their hands into their own pockets and given it one-twentieth part of their incomes, they

would have easily set the Church of Wales upon its legs again for the next 10 years to come. Look at what is taking place in the Colonies, in Canada, in Australia, and in Ireland. In all those countries the Church of England has learned to stand alone. Even in Wales, of which you are now rearing, the power and influence of the Church are in exactly inverse proportion to the assistance which she derives from the State, and to say that the richest community of Christian men in the whole world would not be able to hold its own amongst the most God-fearing people in the Kingdom unless it comes carrying a bribe in one hand and a sword of State in the other is a slur upon the Church, an insult to my countrymen, and an unworthy aspersion upon an all-wise and all-powerful Providence.

(10.50.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Anybody who heard the concluding part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech would have supposed that the Established Church in Wales depended entirely for its funds upon the ancient endowments with which the pious in past generations had endowed it. But the right hon. Gentleman might be aware, had he consulted statistics open to every man upon this subject, that during last year the Church in Wales received from voluntary contributions twice as much as it received from endowments secured to it by law; and if that is not a conclusive proof that the members of the Church in Wales have the keenest sense of the duties imposed upon them, and are determined to carry out to the best of their ability the great trust which is imposed upon them, I fail to understand by what reasoning the right hon. Gentleman has arrived at the conclusion that the deprivation of the endowments which already exist could increase the zeal or the resources which the Church has at its disposal. Now the House, or those Members who have listened as I have to the greater part of this Debate, will probably share with me in the gratification I feel in finding that a good many of the old fallacies with which this discussion used to be encumbered have either dis-

appeared altogether from the discussion, or have at all events shown themselves in a very much less virulent form. We used to be told that the Welsh Church was an alien Church. I have heard only one gentleman sufficiently courageous to maintain that position this evening. This is an historical fallacy, one of the many which collected round this subject, which I certainly had supposed had been finally disposed of, had been killed off by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian last year. The right hon. Gentleman said nothing but what is familiar to students of British Ecclesiastical History, but he did say a good many things which were not familiar even to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway; and I am glad to observe by the majority of the speeches, and by the general tenour of the Debate, that very few indeed are the defenders still left in this House of the historical absurdity of supposing that the Church in Wales was imposed upon the Welsh people by an armed and an alien population. Another fallacy which I observe looms much less largely than it used to do in our eyes is the statistical fallacy. Many gentlemen have touched upon statistics, but I notice that they have touched upon them lightly. It appears to be ground which they thought it necessary to survey, but which they surveyed as rapidly as they could, and from which they discreetly fled at the earliest opportunity. The Member for Flintshire, who opened in a very exhaustive speech the discussion this evening told us that he would not enter upon the subject of Welsh statistics at all. He confined his attention to the statistics of the Welsh Church in Liverpool and in America; and from the facts which he collected, or thought he had collected, from Liverpool and from America—neither of which is as yet claimed as part of the Principality—he deduced the statistical conclusion that the Welsh Church ought to be disestablished. The hon. and learned Gentleman took what he called a broad view of statistics and the broad view he took consisted of making very broad assertions and bringing forward no proof whatever in



support of them. My hon. and learned Friend near me went in detail into the figures that had been supplied by the Nonconformists to the Church of England, and by Nonconformists to their own body; and both from the figures which they had collected in respect of the Established Church in Wales and in respect of the figures—which I presume we may regard as more or less authentic—with regard to the Nonconformist body in Wales, my hon. and learned Friend deduced the conclusion that it was impossible that the majority of the Welsh population—including men, women and children—could be supposed to belong to any of the larger bodies of the Nonconformist body in that country. Has any answer been made to that? No answer except the broad conclusion of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, in which he carefully abstained from quoting a single figure or dealing with a single specific fact brought forward by my hon. and learned Friend near me. But in truth the Nonconformist Party in this House are out of court when we are considering the question of statistics, for they have refused—flatly refused—the only machinery in this matter by which authentic statistics could possibly be obtained. They were offered last year, as they have been offered decennially before, to have a religious census taken in Wales as a religious census is taken in Ireland. Nobody doubts that the census in Ireland gives, on the whole, a substantially accurate view of the relative strength of the various denominations in that country. Why is the same machinery, applied to the same purpose, to be set aside by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down as worthless when applied to Wales? The fact, which lies broad and patent upon the surface of this controversy, is that the Gentlemen who refuse the census are afraid of statistics; and though in this Resolution they practically base their contention upon the relative strength, which they are good enough to assume, of the adherents of the Established Church and the Nonconformists, they have always, as a matter of fact, refused what we have always offered to them;

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

an authentic, a reliable, and a per conclusive method of arriving at a conclusion on that point. For my part, I should be ready enough to the case of the Established Church in Wales upon arithmetical proportions, although I hold that the argument from arithmetical proportion is wholly absurd and unreliable. This House were to take the view, which are invited to take, that because the Established Church in Wales is the Church of the minority, that, the it should be disestablished, should not be driven to the further conclusion that in every diocese, perhaps in every parish of England, the same arithmetical test should be applied, and that province, diocese, or parish the members of the Established Church happened to be in a majority and only, should the Church be allowed to retain its endowments, and be the Established Church of the country. I do not believe that any logic consistent adherent of Disestablishment will accept that view. I do not think that those who really, upon grounds which do not agree with, which are not historical, and rational, desire the severance between Church and State and the Disendowment of the Established Church—I do not think that these Gentlemen would at the moment accept the logic which before them by Members from Wales rest their case, or almost rest their case, upon statistics which they have verified, and which according to the view prove a majority on the part of the Nonconformist bodies taken over the Established Church alone. But certainly it appears that when we are dealing with antiquities, almost the oldest in the country, older far I may fairly say than the House, older certainly than all the institutions on which we rely on ourselves—when dealing with institutions which it is not to be supposed a moment is obsolete or dead, any way lifeless or extinct, the only proof lies with those who wish to destroy, and not with those who wish to sustain it. Now, what is the proof these Gentlemen can bring forward or have brought forward, who wish to destroy—who desire to disestablish

to disendow the Church in Wales? The hon. Member for Carnarvon rested his case almost entirely upon the fact that the Welsh Church was not the National Church, and he appeared to think that Nonconformity in Wales was national in the sense in which the Church of Wales is not national. The hon. Gentleman showed a total and extraordinary ignorance of the history of this case. Nonconformity in Wales is the growth of a century or two. The Church in Wales has existed for centuries. Not only was it not imposed upon the Welsh people by a large and alien population, but it is a Church which has grown with the growth of the Welsh people, which is identified with their history in every stage, and to which I believe they largely owe the maintenance of their language as the vernacular. (Cries of "Oh, oh.") I believe that, and I believe it on the authority of gentlemen quite as anxious to destroy the Welsh Church as the hon. Gentlemen opposite—Gentlemen who have devoted more time to the study of the Welsh language than the hon. Gentlemen opposite have been able to do, and who believe that the Established Church in Wales is a Church of Welsh growth, identified with it through every stage of Welsh history, and closely bound up with the maintenance and the survival of the Welsh language. Nonconformity—I do not deny the value of the work which has been done by the great Nonconformist leaders in Wales; but I say that Nonconformity is a growth as of yesterday, and that the Welsh Church is not a growth of yesterday. And I say further that the great men who led the Nonconformist party in Wales, the men who have done so much for the revival of religion in Wales, were themselves devoted adherents to the Established Church to their dying day. Therefore I am justified, I think, on grounds of the history both of the Church and of Nonconformity, in saying that whatever other reasons may be given for the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, at all events you cannot say that it is to be Disestablished because it is an anti-national Church. Then I ask myself whether those who desire Disestab-

lishment desire it because they think that it is a decaying branch of the Christian Church, corrupt and effete, no longer capable of efficient service to the cause of true religion. I gather from the speech of every one who spoke in favour of the Motion to-night, that whatever else may be said of the Welsh Church, that, at all events cannot be said. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen admitted the rapid growth which had been made by the Welsh Church during the last two generations at least; but he said:—

"You will always find that an institution which has to be revolutionised is, before being revolutionised, undergoing a great process of reform, and the fact that the Welsh Church is improving, the fact that it is showing renewed activity and vigour in every branch, is only an indication that it belongs to that large number of institutions which require revolutionary reform, and the fact that it shows this improvement is only another proof of the fact."

And he quoted the French Revolution, and he might have quoted—and I think he might have quoted accurately—a very large number of historical facts, of which he if any Member in this House, is a complete and acknowledged master. The hon. and learned Gentleman drew the inference from this fact, the conclusion that the Welsh Church ought to be at once destroyed and disestablished. I draw a very different conclusion. I admit with him that history shows many examples of institutions which were in a fair way of reforming themselves, which showed every sign of growth and of progress, and whose existence was brought to an untimely end by the hands of so-called reformers. But the deductions I make from these historical facts is that the gentlemen who dub themselves reformers, and are sometimes so described by subsequent historians, have really much less to do with the progress and improvement of human affairs than either they or the historians are apt to suppose. I cannot help thinking that if this process of spontaneous improvement and growth from within were sometimes allowed to continue a little longer by reformers of the complexion of the hon. and learned Gentleman, the world would not progress slower, but would progress

more rapidly, and certainly much more smoothly, and with much less embittered controversy. I assume then that it is not on natural grounds that the Church is to be Disestablished, nor on the ground that it is not showing the powers of reforming itself. Is it then on the ground that the doctrine it teaches is a doctrine which this country cannot sanction—a doctrine which should be stamped out and suppressed by every means at the disposal of the British Parliament? Of course we on this side of the House do not take this view. Nor do I understand hon. Gentlemen opposite to take it, because they are good enough to assure us that if only we were to Disestablish the Welsh Church it would be stronger than ever, and the doctrine it preaches it will preach with renewed efficacy and increase of life. That being so—and whether it is so or not I will say a word directly—at all events it shows this, that hon. Gentleman do not object to the Established Church because they object to the doctrine taught by the Established Church. But, if they do object to it, then according to their own principle it ought to be maintained, because nothing could so much weaken its strength as to allow it to remain in connection with the State. I quite admit—and I fully and freely admit—that there are a very large number of Gentlemen who are in favour of Disestablishment upon abstract, general, and historical grounds; but I cannot admit, with the facts before me, that those who desire the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, desire it upon abstract, or historical grounds. They want Disestablishment, because they want Disendowment. Disestablishment is on their lips, Disestablishment is in their Resolution, but what they want is Disendowment. It is not reform they desire, but plunder. Envy, envy, not piety is the motive of their action. Some hon. Gentleman has stood up this evening, and has told us that the Church would be more efficient in a condition of Apostolic poverty. I apply that principle to the Nonconformist Body to which they belong. Do they think that this Nonconformist Body, if deprived of their endowments, if de-

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

prived of those gifts made to them time to time by pious and spirited members of their congregations, do they think that the conformist Bodies would do their more efficiently than they are doing now? I understand that they are energetic in obtaining gifts and endowments for their Body, and that show as much zeal and public spirit as any member of the Established Church; and I fail altogether to understand why, if poverty is to be a great benefit to the Established Church, it is not to be applied with equal hand to all other denominations within the limits of the four seas. The truth is, that behind this cry of religious equality lurks a great fallacy. For my own part, I should desire to see every teaching religious body prosperous, well endowed, and able to carry on to the best advantage the work entrusted to it. That is equality which I desire, and in religion and in other matters, I also wish to see equality with regard to sections of the community and individuals, providing that equality means giving to those who have what they lack, and not taking from those that have, that which can put to a useful purpose. Equality in the one sense is a great practical ideal; in the other sense desire for equality is the meanest of political passions. I cannot help thinking sometimes those who desire to deprive the Established Church of property which was from time immemorial given to her by pious members who were of her faith down to the generation and the year in which we live—I cannot help thinking that those who desire to deprive her of those means of public utility, are, perhaps unconsciously, more animated by wish to take away from the Church that which she has, than to give to Nonconformists that which they do not. Now, is it not true that those who desire what is erroneously called Disestablishment, but is really Disendowment, are much more interested in taking away the money which the Church has, than in applying it to new purposes? They never tell us what they are going to do with it,

never pretend that they have objects of higher and more sacred value than the ends and objects which are now sub-served by these endowments. They do not contend that their notions of equality would be satisfied if the money taken away from the Established Church were thereupon tossed into the sea. I do not say that they would not like to use it for some other purpose, but that rather than leave it to the Established Church they would like to see its whole wealth destroyed from off the face of the earth, and the clergy reduced to that position which they have indicated. We must all of us have seen in countries which have been long inhabited, ancient buildings which have been destroyed and wrecked in order that out of their fragments might be constructed some new jerry building, some new ephemeral structure, intended to meet the passing wants of the moment, and we must all have felt how tragic was the fate of those ancient palaces and churches so mis-used for baser purposes. Does not experience show that it is the same with the pillage of national Churches? I do not suppose that in these days the plunder would be devoted to increasing the fortunes of a Court favourite. Those days are passed. But I have no evidence that the plunder would be disposed of in a better way. It would be handed over, I presume, as a prey to wire-pullers and electioneers to be squandered on the object which, for the moment, happened to tickle the fancy of the electorate of the day. A few years would pass, and the endowment made by the pious donors of 15 generations would be dissipated on this or that scheme, and would leave not a trace or wreck behind it, leaving the Church permanently poorer for all the great objects for which she was called into existence. The hon. and learned Member for Aberdeen asked us whether we could permanently defend the position we have taken up. He told us that by giving up the Church in Wales we should strengthen the Church in England. We are familiar with that argument. I notice that it is not usually employed by the friends of the Church. I notice that those who are most

anxious for the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales, and who spend money to get it Disestablished, are not those who desire to see the Establishment maintained in England. I suppose they know their business to the full as well as the hon. and learned Member for Aberdeen; but, Sir, I believe, and I think, that in this respect I speak for every single Member who sits on this side of the House, and for many who sit on the other side, that the fate of the Church in Wales is indissolubly bound up with the fate of the Church in England, and I believe that both in England and in Wales the Church can be, and will be defended by this House. I admit that hon. Gentlemen have had—and doubtless will have in the future—large minorities in the Lobbies of this House. But they belong to a Party which is irrevocably committed to a policy by which so vast a measure as Disestablishment must be placed further and further into the far future; they belong to a Party which is committed to a series of measures which must postpone indefinitely, so far as I can see, even if the country agree to it, the serious consideration of anything so formidable as a Disestablishment Bill. But I have the conviction that the Church of England and the Church of Wales are destined in the indefinite future to maintain the position they have maintained throughout an almost indefinite past, and if I can interpret in any way the currents of public opinion, if I am right in seeing below the surface of Parliamentary Debates and Parliamentary Divisions the true direction in which the thought of this country runs, I do not think that it runs in the direction of Disestablishment. I believe that perhaps after a long re-action men are more and more coming to the conclusion that religion is the essence of society, and that society cannot be held together if religion perishes or is atrophied. While I recognise that tendency, and that current of public opinion, I think I also see that more and more people are disposed to think that if religion be one of the great interests of society, if it be in truth one of the things which we should foster to the best of our ability, it is to an Established Church—not alone, but

principally—that that great duty should be assigned.

(11.30.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I do not think, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman could have more accurately defined the distinction which divides that side of the House from this than in stating that, in his belief, religion principally depends upon Establishment. We are ready, as soon as he chooses to take the opinion of the country on that point. Sir, the whole course of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, if he will allow me to say so, depends upon the fallacy of identifying the Church with an Establishment. In my opinion, an Establishment is not a source of strength to the Church, but a source of weakness, and the attempt to represent that men who are hostile to Establishment are therefore enemies of the Church is to represent a state of things, which, at all events, in my opinion, is contrary to the fact. We have had, in many respects, an interesting Debate, and I thought it a promising Debate when I heard the speech of the Solicitor General. He declared uncompromising opposition to the principles of this Motion. Well, Sir, we have had many uncompromising statements from the Solicitor General, but I have always observed that those statements seriously compromised the situation. It is only a few years ago that, upon another subject, we had an emphatic "No" from the hon. and learned Gentleman, and yet last night we had an emphatic "Yes" from him upon the same subject. Therefore, when I hear of his uncompromising opposition I confess I am not alarmed. We had another speech—a speech which, I suppose, is intended to represent the animus and spirit of the clergy for whom the hon. Member for Bradford is supposed to speak. If you want to know why the Establishment and why the clergy are not beloved of the Welsh people you have only to listen to that speech. The hon. Member complained with acrimony of a language which he did not understand. We are able ourselves to appreciate the acrimony of language which we do not understand. I desire no better illustration of why

*Mr. A. J. Balfour;*

the Church in Wales is alien to the affections of the people than in that speech, which is understood to be a representation of the spirit and traditions of the Church. I confess that I heard with some satisfaction the speech of the Solicitor General, because I observe that the speeches of the Solicitor General resemble that darkest hour which is always supposed to precede the dawn; though the hon. and learned Member's speeches are always ingenious, always eloquent, and always frank—so much I must do him the justice to admit. Now the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury expressed his readiness to rest upon statistics. He thought the arithmetical argument was conclusive in his favour. He complained that there had been no census in Wales upon this subject. Yes, Sir, there is a census which must be taken every seven years, and which will be taken again before long. What is the census of the polling booths in Wales? That census represents every registered householder in Wales; and is it not a singular thing if you maintain that the majority of the Welsh people are in favour of the Established Church, that you should have an almost unanimous voice from the Welsh people against the Established Church? For any man of common sense, that will dispose of the statistical argument. I should like to hear the answer to that. If you have a majority of the Welsh people—if you have the Welsh people almost unanimous—against the Established Church, how can you deny that the majority of the Welsh people are adverse to the Established Church? Then, why do not a majority of the people elect Members in favour of the Established Church? Then the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has another argument—the argument from antiquity. We know the view of the right hon. Gentleman on the subject of antiquity. He gave it to us the other night. He says he has a preference for stupid things that have been done before, which he thinks are better than wise things which are new. There again the right hon. Gentleman has accurately defined the differences between that side of the

House and this. The Party opposite are the historical and traditional representatives of stupid things which have been done before, and we are the advocates of the wise things which are new. I am extremely glad to find that I am so entirely at one with the right hon. Gentleman in his definition of the political situation. He says we are proposing to stamp out the doctrine of the Church in Wales because we object to Establishment and Endowment. Is the doctrine of the Church to be stamped out?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (interrupting): I did not say so.

SIR W. HARCOURT: I have no intention of misrepresenting the right hon. Gentleman, but I gathered that from his observations. Well, then, we agree with the right hon. Gentleman that Disestablishment and Disendowment do not affect the doctrine of the Church at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Will not stamp it out.

SIR W. HARCOURT: Will not stamp it out. But will it injure the doctrine? If the right hon. Gentleman asserts that the doctrine of the Church will be injured, I cannot agree with him there. Now, upon the question of numerical majority, I cannot set that aside in so philosophical a manner as the right hon. Gentleman does. It has been called to-night by the Solicitor General a separatist argument, and the hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian. But where did my right hon. Friend take that from? He took it from the speech of a gentleman whom we are sorry to miss in this House—from a speech made by the present Duke of Devonshire in reference to the Church of Scotland. Lord Hartington declared he was ready to support the Disestablishment of the Church in Scotland as soon as he was satisfied that a majority of the people of Scotland were in favour of that. Well, is that a separatist argument? I do not know whether the representative of the Duke of Devonshire here (Mr. Chamberlain) holds that opinion? I hardly think he will confirm the Solicitor General in the opinion that this is a separatist

argument. Why, it is obvious you cannot found a National Church upon a minority of the people—nobody ever dreamed of such a foundation for a National Church supported by the State. What business has the State to support as a National Church a Church which is only the Church of a minority? The old theory of the foundation of a National Church was, that it was the universal religion in the State, and, indeed, it was the compulsory religion of the State in former days. But there is no question about that now. Now, I heard the most dangerous doctrine from the right hon. Gentleman. He wished, he said, to see all religious sects endowed. Has the Unionist party then adopted the principle of concurrent endowment? He wished, he said, to see all sections of religion prosperous. Yes, and so do we; but prosperous through the congregations upon whom they depend, not from the sources the right hon. Gentleman alluded to. We are perfectly in favour of religious denominations, having the support of members of the denominations. I am not going to enter into particulars of the Welsh question, which have been dealt with by gentlemen more familiar with them than I am; but, in the short time I intend to occupy the time of the House, I desire to say a few words upon the question whether or not Establishment and Endowment strengthen a Church. That seems to be assumed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I think we have good reasons for believing exactly the opposite. Nobody acquainted with the present social condition of England can have failed to perceive the enormous difference in the position occupied by the Church of England in the great towns and in country districts. In the great towns of England the Anglican Church is strong, is rich, powerful and influential. It has in my opinion grown in power and influence among the town populations. And why? You know perfectly well that in the large and prosperous towns Establishment and Endowment play a very small part in the history of the Church. The wealth of the Church there does not come from the State or from Endowment, it comes from the

principally—that that great duty should be assigned.

(11.30.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I do not think, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman could have more accurately defined the distinction which divides that side of the House from this than in stating that, in his belief, religion principally depends upon Establishment. We are ready, as soon as he chooses to take the opinion of the country on that point. Sir, the whole course of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, if he will allow me to say so, depends upon the fallacy of identifying the Church with an Establishment. In my opinion, an Establishment is not a source of strength to the Church, but a source of weakness, and the attempt to represent that men who are hostile to Establishment are therefore enemies of the Church is to represent a state of things, which, at all events, in my opinion, is contrary to the fact. We have had, in many respects, an interesting Debate, and I thought it a promising Debate when I heard the speech of the Solicitor General. He declared uncompromising opposition to the principles of this Motion. Well, Sir, we have had many uncompromising statements from the Solicitor General, but I have always observed that those statements seriously compromised the situation. It is only a few years ago that, upon another subject, we had an emphatic "No" from the hon. and learned Gentleman, and yet last night we had an emphatic "Yes" from him upon the same subject. Therefore, when I hear of his uncompromising opposition I confess I am not alarmed. We had another speech—a speech which, I suppose, is intended to represent the animus and spirit of the clergy for whom the hon. Member for Bradford is supposed to speak. If you want to know why the Establishment and why the clergy are not beloved of the Welsh people you have only to listen to that speech. The hon. Member complained with acrimony of a language which he did not understand. We are able ourselves to appreciate the acrimony of language which we do not understand. I desire no better illustration of why

*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*

the Church in Wales is alien to the affections of the people than in that speech, which is understood to be a representation of the spirit and traditions of the Church. I confess that I heard with some satisfaction the speech of the Solicitor General, because I observe that the speeches of the Solicitor General resemble that darkest hour which is always supposed to precede the dawn; though the hon. and learned Member's speeches are always ingenious, always eloquent, and always frank—so much I must do him the justice to admit. Now the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury expressed his readiness to rest upon statistics. He thought the arithmetical argument was conclusive in his favour. He complained that there had been no census in Wales upon this subject. Yes, Sir, there is a census which must be taken every seven years, and which will be taken again before long. What is the census of the polling booths in Wales? That census represents every registered householder in Wales; and is it not a singular thing if you maintain that the majority of the Welsh people are in favour of the Established Church, that you should have an almost unanimous voice from the Welsh people against the Established Church? For any man of common sense, that will dispose of the statistical argument. I should like to hear the answer to that. If you have a majority of the Welsh people—if you have the Welsh people almost unanimous—against the Established Church, how can you deny that the majority of the Welsh people are adverse to the Established Church? Then, why do not a majority of the people elect Members in favour of the Established Church? Then the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has another argument—the argument from antiquity. We know the view of the right hon. Gentleman on the subject of antiquity. He gave it to us the other night. He says he has a preference for stupid things that have been done before, which he thinks are better than wise things which are new. There again the right hon. Gentleman has accurately defined the differences between that side of the

House and this. The Party opposite are the historical and traditional representatives of stupid things which have been done before, and we are the advocates of the wise things which are new. I am extremely glad to find that I am so entirely at one with the right hon. Gentleman in his definition of the political situation. He says we are proposing to stamp out the doctrine of the Church in Wales because we object to Establishment and Endowment. Is the doctrine of the Church to be stamped out?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (interrupting): did not say so.

SIR. W. HARCOURT: I have no intention of misrepresenting the right hon. Gentleman, but I gathered that from his observations. Well, then, we agree with the right hon. Gentleman that Disestablishment and Disendowment do not affect the doctrine of the Church at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Will not stamp it out.

SIR W. HARCOURT: Will not stamp it out. But will it injure the doctrine? If the right hon. Gentleman asserts that the doctrine of the Church will be injured, I cannot agree with him there. Now, upon the question of numerical majority, I cannot set that aside in so philosophical a manner as the right hon. Gentleman does. It has been called to-night by the Solicitor General a separatist argument, and the hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian. But where did my right hon. Friend take that from? He took it from the speech of a gentleman whom we are sorry to miss in this House—from a speech made by the present Duke of Devonshire in reference to the Church of Scotland. Lord Dartington declared he was ready to support the Disestablishment of the Church in Scotland as soon as he was satisfied that a majority of the people of Scotland were in favour of that. Well, is that a separatist argument? I do not know whether the representative of the Duke of Devonshire here (Mr. Chamberlain) holds that opinion? I hardly think he will confirm the Solicitor General in the opinion that this is a separatist

argument. Why, it is obvious you cannot found a National Church upon a minority of the people—nobody ever dreamed of such a foundation for a National Church supported by the State. What business has the State to support as a National Church a Church which is only the Church of a minority? The old theory of the foundation of a National Church was, that it was the universal religion in the State, and, indeed, it was the compulsory religion of the State in former days. But there is no question about that now. Now, I heard the most dangerous doctrine from the right hon. Gentleman. He wished, he said, to see all religious sects endowed. Has the Unionist party then adopted the principle of concurrent endowment? He wished, he said, to see all sections of religion prosperous. Yes, and so do we; but prosperous through the congregations upon whom they depend, not from the sources the right hon. Gentleman alluded to. We are perfectly in favour of religious denominations, having the support of members of the denominations. I am not going to enter into particulars of the Welsh question, which have been dealt with by gentlemen more familiar with them than I am; but, in the short time I intend to occupy the time of the House, I desire to say a few words upon the question whether or not Establishment and Endowment strengthen a Church. That seems to be assumed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I think we have good reasons for believing exactly the opposite. Nobody acquainted with the present social condition of England can have failed to perceive the enormous difference in the position occupied by the Church of England in the great towns and in country districts. In the great towns of England the Anglican Church is strong, is rich, powerful and influential. It has in my opinion grown in power and influence among the town populations. And why? You know perfectly well that in the large and prosperous towns Establishment and Endowment play a very small part in the history of the Church. The wealth of the Church there does not come from the State or from Endowment, it comes from the



munificence of its congregations. There the Church relies upon its own efforts, and there it is powerful and rich. Take this great metropolis outside the City of London. The endowments are insignificant, but the support given to the Church by subscriptions is immense. It is only within the City of London that you find churches with endowments, but without congregations. Turn to the rural districts; is it the same thing there? Why, I might ask the Gentlemen opposite as much as those who sit behind me, is the parson a popular character in rural districts? ("Yes.") Is he? I ask the candidates for the Eastern Counties what they think? I know it is not the fact. I know that the gentlemen who rely on the support of the clergy in rural elections rely on a broken reed. What is the meaning of this unpopularity of the parson in rural districts? It is not the fault of the men, for they are men of elevated character, high education, and they bear blameless lives, and discharge their duties to the best of their ability. (Interruptions.) I should have thought hon. Members opposite would have joined in that view; I am sorry to find they do not. But the position of the Clergy is altogether different in the rural districts from the position in populous towns; for there (in the country) the Church is ostentatiously Established and Endowed, and becomes a Militant Church. It is a Militant Establishment. The Solicitor-General said he thought we had very much improved; that we had got rid of the drinking parson and the gambling parson, and he hoped we should get rid of the magisterial parson. So do I, for I know something of the sentences of magisterial parsons. The Solicitor-General went on to say he thought we were getting rid of the political parson. Now, I have a high opinion of the power of the Solicitor-General; but if he is going to get rid of the political parson, he is going to accomplish a labour equal to the greatest of Hercules'. Are there any signs of our getting rid of political parsons? No; the Clergy are more political now than ever they were in former times. What has inspired the bitter spirit of Party poli-

*Sir W. Harcourt*

tics in the Church and among Nonconformists? Yes, among Nonconformists too! It is the question of Disestablishment and Disendowment—the defence on one side, the attack on the other. What is it that has made the Clergy from generation to generation the opponents of all reform? When the question of slavery arose, who were the anti-slavery party? The Church party. No; everybody knows that the anti-slavery party was the Nonconformist party. Why was that? Because at that time slavery was an established institution. Why is it that the Church has always found it necessary to put itself upon the side of vested interests? Because it is a vested interest itself. Why is it that on every reform, whether the reform is upon a matter of religion which you might understand, or on such questions as the suffrage, you have always found the Established Church opposed to these reforms? (Cries of "Divide.") One has a right to expect from hon. Members opposite that they will listen, though they may dispute on principle. I say it is a proposition no man can deny that the Church has been, as a body, opposed from generation to generation to all measures of reform. In my opinion that has done the Church great injury among the people. Often do we hear the phrase "divorcing the people from the soil," and in my opinion Establishment and Endowment have led to this feeling, and have done much to divorce the Church from the hearts of the people. That is the history of the unpleasantness, the bitterness, which exists against the Church in Wales. Look at the Universities. The Universities have rejected every man who has been a supporter of reform. Lord Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, Sir Robert Peel, my right hon. Friend the Member for Midlothian, great and distinguished men, could not represent the Universities. We have now in the House two of the most distinguished men who ever represented Universities—first in science, first in scholarship in England, and, I might say, in Europe; but what chance would these gentlemen have had to represent the Universities here if they had not belonged to the Anti-Reforming Party. All their

science, all their learning, would not have availed if they had not been "sound" on the Irish question. I say, then, that Establishment and Endowment have done immense evil, and not good, to the Church. The Church of England being established as a monopoly, has necessarily placed the Church on the side of all monopolies. The Church being itself established and privileged, has ranged the Church on the side of privileges and in favour of many abuses. In my opinion, so far from adding strength to the Church in respect to religious doctrines and influence among the people, Establishment and Endowment have been the greatest hindrances to the Church in influence among the people, and it is mainly upon that ground that I support the Resolution which is now before us.

(11.55.) Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes 220 ;  
Noes 267.—(Div. List, No. 5.)

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the Committee of Public Accounts do consist of Twelve Members :—Mr. Barran, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Crawford, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Salt, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Wodehouse, and Sir John Gorst.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(Sir John Gorst.)

#### PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

##### DISTRIBUTION.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in superintending the form and regulating the Distribution of Parliamentary Papers."—(Sir Herbert Maxwell.)

(12.15.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): May I ask the hon. Baronet, who has charge of this Committee to turn the attention of the Committee to the mode in which Irish papers are dealt with? These are always included in the Papers upon "pink" form, so that to get them Members have to specially order them. Now, as the majority in this House are entirely ignorant upon most Irish matters, I think that if there are any papers which

should be distributed as a matter of course, they are those relating to Ireland. There are matters nearer home upon which it is more desirable that Members should inform themselves—that upon those relating to distant parts of the world—Japan, Jerusalem, or Madagascar.

(12.16.) SIR HERBERT MAXWELL (Wigton): The rule hitherto adopted in respect to Irish papers is exactly the same as that which applies to papers upon other matters. Every paper, as a matter of fact, is put on the "pink" list, and is not circulated among Members unless they require it; and the only papers, as far as my recollection serves me, which are distributed without request are Reports of Royal Commissions, Reports of Select Committees, and such papers as have been promised by Heads of Departments on special occasions and in anticipation of particular debates. Should the House agree to the re-appointment of the Committee I will take care that the view the hon. Member has just expressed is put before the Committee, with a view to such regulations as may be required.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of :—Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Causton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Gill, Mr. Howell, Mr. James Maclean, and Sir Herbert Maxwell.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

#### PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed :—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it :—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House :

The Committee was accordingly nominated of :—Mr. Hugh Elliot, Colonel Bridgeman, Mr

Donald Crawford, Mr. Mulholland Mr. Wiggins, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Sir Charles Dalrymple, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy, Mr. Tollemache, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Sir John Ellis, Mr. Bristowe, and Mr. Biddulph :

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. M'Lagan.*)

SUPERANNUATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Bill to amend the Acts relating to Superannuation Allowances and Gratuities to persons in the Public Service so far as respects the computation of successive service in different offices, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Herbert Maxwell, and Sir John Gorst.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 191.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1889) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. E. Robertson, Bill to amend "The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Joseph Bolton, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. M'Lagan, and Mr. Angus Sutherland.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 185.]

VALUATION OF LANDS (SCOTLAND) LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. E. Robertson, Bill to amend the Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Bryce, and Mr. Hunter.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 186.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (VOTES OF SEAMEN) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Heneage, Bill to enable Master Mariners, Engineers, Seamen, and Fishermen to Vote in the Election of Members of Parliament by means of voting papers, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Heneage, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Grottrian, Mr. Anstruther, Mr. Duff, Mr. Maclure, Sir Savile Crossley, and Mr. Asher.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 187.]

GENERAL POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. J. P. Smith, Bill to amend "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Hozier, and Mr. John Wilson (Lanark).

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 188.]

BALLOT ACT (1872) AMENDMENT

On Motion of Colonel Waring, Bill "The Ballot Act, 1872," ordered to be in by Colonel Waring, Colonel Sau Mr. Macartney, Mr. Webster, Mr. Byr Mr. Sinclair, and Mr. Hozier.

Bill presented, and read first time. [

CONTEMPT OF COURT (APPEAL)

On Motion of Mr. Warmington, giving a right of Appeal to all persons committed to Prison or attached for Cont Court; and for other purposes, order brought in by Mr. Warmington, Mr. Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Bernard C Mr. Gainsford Bruce, and Mr. Birrell.

Bill presented, and read first time. [I

ORDER OF THE DAY.

FEUS AND BUILDING LEASES LAND) BILL.—(No. 172).

Order for Second Reading read discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

On Motion of Mr. Donald Cra ordered, that leave be given to bring another Bill in lieu thereof.

Bill presented, and read first time. [B

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND W.

Copy ordered—

"Of monthly comparative Statement number of Paupers of all classes Lunatics in Asylums, Registered Houses and Licensed Houses, and Vagrants) receipt of Relief in England and Wales last day of every week in each month several years from 1857 to 1892, inclusive ;"

"And, Statements of the number of Lunatics and Vagrants included) distinguishing the number of adult able-bodied Paupers relieved on the 1st day of January, 18 the 1st day of July, 1892, respectively." Long.)

Copy presented accordingly; upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 78.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday, 24th February, 1892.*

Mr. SPEAKER was in his place soon after 12 o'clock, but it was not until 2.40, and after attention had been called to the fact that there were not 10 Members present, that a quorum was secured.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

## SHOP HOURS BILL. (No. 26.)

## SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

\*(12.41.) MR. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars, &c.): I rise to move the second Reading of this Bill, the object of which is to amend the law relating to the employment of women and young persons in shops. The only Act which applies to the employees in shops is the Shop Hours Regulation Act, passed in 1886, for three years, and which consequently expired in 1889, though it has been annually renewed since. That Act, however, only applies to young persons, and the difference between it and the Bill now before the House is that we, in this Bill, desire to bring women within the provisions of that Act, in fact we desire to re-enact the whole of it, adding the application of it to women. That is the only change we propose to make in the law. The effect of the Shop Hours Regulation Act has been much less than it was expected it would be at the time it was passed, and this chiefly arises from the limitations in the Act itself. There was no machinery provided for putting the Act in force, there was no Inspection Clause included, although the Select Committee, to whom the Bill was referred before it was passed, spoke favourably of a clause covering Government inspection, saying it would be of very great service. But no such clause was inserted in the Act, and consequently it is no man's business to see that the law is carried out. The law then became inoperative, and I doubt if one shopkeeper in three knows of the law he

should observe. But there has been some benefit from that Act, even with the limited operation it has had, and for what has been done under the Act we are chiefly indebted to the Early Closing Association in London, and other Associations of a similar kind throughout the country. These Associations have sometimes notified offending shopkeepers and sometimes have instituted prosecutions. In asking that women should be included in the Act, we are not, as every hon. Member knows, endeavouring to enact any fresh principle in law. Nearly 50 years ago there was an Act passed limiting the working hours of women to 60 in the week, and since then there has been a steady succession of Factory and Workshops Acts, in all of which some provision has been inserted ameliorating the conditions, and in many cases shortening the hours women are expected to work in factories and workshops. There can be no doubt whatever about the benefit resulting from such legislation. I might quote from many speeches delivered from the Government Bench and from Home Secretaries commenting upon the effect of these Acts. I might quote from the evidence of witnesses who have given testimony before Select Committees of this House; and from many other sources I might provide abundant evidence to show that the results of the Factory and Workshops Acts, so far as they have applied to adult women or had anything to do with adult female labour, have been beneficial. Perhaps the shortest way in which I can place a little of this proof before the House will be by referring to the Report of the Select Committee on the Shop Hours Regulation Bill of 1886. That Committee took a great deal of evidence, and recommended the Bill to the House, and it passed into law. In speaking generally on this part of the question, the Committee said—

“The great majority of witnesses expressed their opinion that though voluntary action had effected much improvement, little could be expected from it in the poorer neighbourhoods, and that nothing short of legislation would be effective.”

As regards medical testimony, I will quote only one opinion—that of Dr. Abbot. He, examined as to his opinion

respecting the effect of the labour of shop assistants, said :—

"The labour in shops is as exhausting and trying as attending to machinery in factories and workshops for a corresponding time."

Factory Inspectors have also been examined on this point, and much evidence will be found in the Report of the proceedings of the Commission which sat in 1878, before the Workshops Act was passed. Mr. Taylor, the Inspector for the North-West District of Lancashire, before the Committee of 1886, said :—

"It appears that a large majority of Inspectors of Factories are in favour of some legislative regulation of the hours of labour in shops."

In addition, I need only quote the last paragraph of the Committee's Report, in which they say :—

"In conclusion, your Committee are satisfied that the hours of shop assistants, ranging from 84 to 85 hours a week, must be generally injurious, and often ruinous to health."

I do not think it is necessary that I should place any further evidence before the House, or read more quotations from the opinions expressed by different witnesses. The Committee I have referred to was the last which sat on this question. This particular question did not come immediately before the Committee which sat last year. But think what 84 or 85 hours a week mean! Fourteen hours, for each of the six days, standing in shops—from 8 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. That, I think, will be quite sufficient to show the necessity for some protection to adult women under the law, in the same way that protection is at the present time given to young persons. But in legislating for any class it is important to consider whether the legislation proposed will operate to any extent, and in what way, against the interests of those we desire to protect. It is important to be quite certain, assuming that this Bill becomes law, that women will not thereby lose any opportunity for obtaining employment which is open to them now. On that point I have some experience to lay before the House. Four years ago evidence was collected on this point, and it all went to show that women would not be

affected in this respect if their hours of employment were restricted to 74 hours a week, including meal times, which is the proposition in this Bill. I candidly admit that the opinion of the Early Closing Association was to some extent hostile to my view at that time. I, therefore, proceeded to collect further evidence, and I saw many representatives of institutions interested in the employment of women and the opinion at which I arrived was confirmed by further testimony collected by the Early Closing Association. The Association sent a circular to the officials of every working women's club or society whose address could be obtained, and the replies received afforded substantial testimony in favour of this Bill. This circular set forth that the Association was very anxious to have full and authentic information from the several bodies representing the interests of female labour as to the merits of the Shop Hours Bill, and invited expressions of opinion as to how far, if at all, such a Bill, if passed into law, would be likely to prejudice or interfere with female labour; to what extent such legislation was received with favour or otherwise by those parties interested in the question; and to what extent, if at all, the labour of women would be likely to be brought into competition with that of men. I do not think the circular letter could have been better framed for collecting evidence from working women as to the limit of 74 hours a week in shops and similar places. I wrote to the Association to see what replies had been obtained, the circular being, as I have said, sent to every Association of the kind whose existence and address could be discovered, and I was informed that the inquiries had not brought forth any hostile criticism of the Bill whatever. This was evidence that public opinion on the subject had been ripening from the first idea, only a few years previous, that such legislation would injuriously affect the opportunities of women to obtain employment. Let me just briefly allude to Clause 9 of the Bill, which defines the word "shop." This is taken as including licensed public houses and refreshment houses of all kinds, which, with drapers, are the

*Mr. Provand*

chief offenders in reference to the over-working of women. I might put forth hundreds of cases where the health of women has been permanently injured on account of the long hours of employment in such shops. They have been published; there are two volumes of such cases. There is confirmatory evidence from medical authorities; all the hospitals have examples of such cases. The Early Closing Association has got together many records of them, but I do not desire to work on the feelings of the House or occupy time unnecessarily, for it is sufficient to refer to the paragraph of the Report on the evidence taken in 1886, in which the Committee have recorded their opinion that such long hours must be generally injurious and often ruinous to health. It is impossible to get over the evidence on this point given only five years ago in reference to an Act of which this is an amending Bill. Clause 10 in the present Bill exempts all members of the same family who may carry on a business together—that is to say, this Bill will only apply to assistants engaged by an employer, and not to the members of a family who keep a shop for and by themselves; these may carry on their employment for any number of hours they may think proper. There is one clause in the Bill—Clause 8—which has not a place in the original Act, a clause providing for the appointment of Inspectors. I have taken this clause, as it stands, from the Factory and Workshops Act, 1878, and I have done so because the Committee of 1886 drew attention to the absence of a clause from the Bill before them dealing with Government inspection, and expressed an opinion that a clause of that kind would have very considerable effect. We know now that it was the absence of such a clause that rendered the Act of 1886 to a large extent inoperative. These clauses will be dealt with in Committee, and for the present I have only to ask the House to accept the principle of the Bill that adult women shall be brought under the law, which at the present time applies only to young persons. I intend to accept the proposal of the right hon. Baronet (Sir John Lubbock), that the Bill shall be referred to a Select Committee, and if

the Government agree to accept the Second Reading upon this understanding, I need not occupy the time of the House much longer. I believe that even with this brief statement of the reasons for the Bill I have made out a strong case; but if I were to add anything further it would be to point out how little it is we are asking by this Bill. I have mentioned already that the work of women was legislated for nearly 50 years ago; and if I were to take the last Act passed in this direction 13 years ago and compare it with this Bill, how meagre will the regulations appear which we ask for on their behalf. The Act of 1878, besides limiting the working hours to 60 in the week, has many other regulating and limiting clauses, of which there are none in this Bill. That Act regulates the number of hours during which women are to be continuously employed in factories and workshops; it regulates the holidays and half-holidays; it requires certificates as to the fitness of young persons before they undertake the work required from them; it requires surgical certificates; it makes precise stipulations as to meals, as to the time set apart for them, and as to where and when they shall be taken; and the Act also deals elaborately with the sanitary conditions of the places of employment, ventilation, and so on. There are many other controlling clauses for the regulation of the conditions under which women are employed in factories and workshops. Nothing of the kind is proposed in the present Bill. We are content with the inclusion of adult women in the law now applied to young persons. I do not say that 74 hours a-week are not too long for employment. I do think they are too long. Nevertheless, I think it is better that the Act should pass in the simple form presented by the Bill, and then, having seen the effect produced, experience will guide us to decide what further requirements may be necessary. One reason strongly in favour of bringing adult women under the law now applied to young persons is to be found in the difficulty women have in combining to provide for their own general benefit. Even when men find both money and management to

assist them to combine it is difficult to keep them together on the Trade Union principle. They will fall away, and, therefore, are entitled to a protection from the law which may be withheld from adult men. Simple as the Bill is, it may have an effect in shortening the hours for men. In many establishments assistants of both sexes are engaged. If half the staff can only be employed for 74 hours in the week, doubtless the effect will be to shorten the hours for the whole of the staff. It will have the effect of shortening the hours of employment for men just as the Factory Acts, though adult men were not included, have shortened the hours of employment all round. I need not occupy the time of the House any longer. With these brief reasons I commend the Bill to the House for a Second Reading, with the understanding that it shall then be referred to a Select Committee, in accordance with the Motion standing in the name of the right hon. Baronet (Sir John Lubbock).

\*(1.2.) MR. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham): I rise to second the Motion for Second Reading, and, in doing so, I shall deal briefly, but, at the same time, broadly, with the general principles of the measure, without entering into details; both because the Second Reading is not the occasion for dealing with clauses, and because the Motion standing in the name of the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir John Lubbock) is to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, where will be offered a far better opportunity for dealing with details than a Second Reading Debate in this House presents. The principle of protecting the labour of women has been affirmed and extended by the Legislature during the past 40 years, and the proposal of the measure now before us is to extend that protection a little further, from women employed in factories and workshops to women employed in retail shops, as defined in the 9th clause. Now, as a matter of principle, I ask, why should that protection not be extended from factories to shops? Is the labour of women in shops less exhausting, less trying to the female frame, than their labour in factories? There is medical evidence to prove that continuously standing

for more than twelve hours a day in shops is not less, but more exhausting, and more trying for women, than work in the mills. It is perfectly notorious that there is a certain class of disorders and diseases which are induced by the continuous standing of shop assistants. The variety of muscular action brought into play by the more varied occupations of the factory and workshop is less trying to a woman than the cruel standing in a shop for twelve or more hours. What does the Bill ask you to do? To limit these hours to 74 in the week. That is more than twelve hours a day, because in the shops to which the Act would probably apply there is, unfortunately, no Saturday half-holiday. So we must take the six days of the week, giving an average of over twelve hours a day. Will any gentleman rise in this House, will any employer of shop labour here rise, and say that a day of over twelve hours—approaching 13 hours—is not enough, and more than enough, for women to be employed throughout the year? And what are the objections to this proposal? The most respectable of the objections is the inconvenience to the public. Of course, in the poorer districts, customers have to do their shopping in the early hours of the morning or the late hours of the evening, often between the hours of 8 and 10. So it is thought inconvenience will arise from the earlier closing of shops. But that is a matter of arrangement, and I cannot see why a shopkeeper, in the slack hours of the morning and afternoon, could not give his *employés*, in turn, an opportunity for rest or for leaving the shop to take fresh air. Another objection equally respectable, and even more formidable, is that the effect of this Bill may be to deprive women of employment, and that it may lead to the substitution of male labour for female labour, and I read a letter to-day on that point in the *Morning Post*. I do not believe the Bill will have any such effect, because men's labour is, of course, dearer than women's labour; and if this measure should lead to anything like a wholesale dismissal of shop-girls and large additions to the employment of male assistants, then we know the wages of men assistants

*Mr. Provand*

would rise beyond the point at which they now stand, making the expenses of the shopkeeper too great. Another argument is that the restriction of women's work will diminish the profits of the shopkeepers; but shopkeepers are the only people who make enormous fortunes in these days: we see evidence of it on every side. One shopkeeper buys a mountain in Scotland for a deer-run; another pays a patrimony for a racehorse; so that the clipping of the profits of these commercial leviathans cannot be weighed against the health and happiness of the women who contribute in some degree to making those fortunes. There are some who object to interference with shopkeepers in the management of their own business; but I quite agree with Carlyle, that there are occasions when you must put a collar upon a man, and compel him to do that which is right. I am in favour of putting a collar upon some of our shopkeepers, to compel them to treat their shopwomen with care and humanity. There is another class of political philosophers opposed to legislation of this kind, who style themselves Individualists, the forlorn and fading remnant of an exploded school. I am an Individualist, but I am in favour of protecting, and not oppressing, the individual. In the struggle between the feeble and the strong, it is liberty which oppresses; it is the law which enfranchises and protects. I should ill discharge my task if I did not say a word or two upon the manner by which it is proposed to give effect to this Bill. It is notorious that the staff of Inspectors of factories and workshops is ludicrously under-manned for the work of the large towns, and I should be quite willing to very largely increase that staff. It is said that to carry out this legislation we should want an army of Inspectors. Very well, let us have an army of Inspectors. Nothing is more discreditable to the Government of this country than the niggardly manner in which the Treasury refuses to consent to the expenditure of a few hundreds of thousands upon an efficient staff of Inspectors, whilst Parliament votes ten millions to assist Irish tenants and English yeomen. I hold that the

health of shopwomen in our large towns is as sufficient an object for the paternal, or even maternal, protection of the State as a British yeomanry. I must refer to an Amendment which stands on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. W. M'Laren), and I shall do so for the purpose of adducing a collateral political reason why the House should read this Bill a second time. The hon. Member proposes to ask the House not to read this Bill until the franchise has been extended to women; and without discussing the Amendment, I would ask if women had votes, what would be the attitude of this House towards the Motion of my hon. Friend? I am an opponent of the enfranchisement of women, but if women had votes this Motion would be moved not from those Benches, but from that (the Treasury) Bench; and we should be all tumbling over one another's heels in our anxiety to support and defend the interests of Mary Ann, just as we are now tumbling over one another's heels to protect the interests of poor Hodge, who has been so long neglected. I ask the House to show, by their willingness to attend to the just demands of the female portion of the community, that it is not necessary to extend the franchise to women in order to secure for them the protection of legislation.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That the Bill be now read a second time."—(Mr. Provand.)

\*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Stockport): In the absence of the Member for Crewe, I propose to move the Amendment which stands on the Paper in his name, and I therefore at once meet the challenge of my hon. Friend who has just sat down. If I thought that those sensible women, who I hope will before long obtain a vote, were with anything like unanimity in favour of this Bill, I should certainly vote for it, without waiting for them to get a vote; but it does not seem to me that there is any proof before the House of any general demand on the part of women for this measure. First, I doubt whether there is any demand at all; and, secondly, whether if there be, it is a just one. At all events it would be very much wiser for the



House to pause until we can ascertain whether women desire an alteration in the laws such as is now proposed. The hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill put it before us as a very small matter indeed, and said he was proposing to introduce "only women." But women form half the human race, at all events. We remember how there was found an envelope left by Dean Swift with the superscription "only a woman's hair." To my mind that was very pathetic; but to some people it was a mere nothing, and that is apparently the opinion of the hon. Member who introduced the Bill as affecting "only women," as to his own proposal.

MR. PROVAND: May I correct the hon. Member? I did not say it was a small matter; but I said it was a simple question, because I refused to overload the Bill with any details of any kind, and confine it to bringing women within the scope of the law which now applies to young persons.

\*MR. GEDGE: I do not see any difference between calling it a simple matter and a small matter, and to my mind it is a very large and important matter. We all agree in the desire that women should not be overworked. None of us contend that 74 hours a week is not quite sufficient time for young women to be compulsorily employed. But my first objection to this Bill is, that while it professes to give protection, it really imposes restraint. The hon. Member who spoke last said "liberty is oppression, but the law enfranchises and protects." One part of the hon. Member's sentence contradicts the other. I am in favour of protecting women by giving them votes, but I hold that they should be able to sell their work as much as they like without any restraint on the part of the law. No doubt the principle of the law interfering to protect those who cannot protect themselves has been admitted for 40 years. But that principle was first strenuously resisted by Mr. Cobden, Mr. John Bright, and the leaders of the Radical school. (A cry of "More shame for them.") Well, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. I was not particularly fond of those gentlemen when they were living, but I should be sorry to say anything to their dis-

credit now. But Lord Shaftesbury and those who worked with him succeeded in overruling that objection by showing that you might push any principle too far. Are we, then, because we have gone so far, to be bound to go still further? If so, where are you going to stop? If you say, because we interfere in cases where the work is of an arduous character, are we bound to extend the same principle of interference for the protection of women to other work? If so, you will have to carry that principle into homes. I have no doubt I could bring a considerable number of cases to show that servant maids have very long hours in houses, and that women who are in employment—if you call their husbands employers—are working a great number of hours. If you vote for this Bill merely because we have admitted the principle of interference, you will be compelled to vote for restriction of every kind proposed in this House. With regard to the clauses, I wish to ask whether a married woman is considered to be employed by her husband, and whether it is intended, under this Bill, to prevent any married woman from being employed in the shops?

MR. PROVAND: Clause 10 of the Bill provides for that.

\*MR. GEDGE: Clause 10 of the Bill is—

"Nothing in this Act shall apply to shops where only persons are employed who are at home; that is to say, are members of the same family dwelling there, or to members of the employer's family dwelling in the house to which the shop is attached."

Why is such a foolish distinction as that made? Because the promoters of the Bill know that without such an exception we should all rise against it. I want to know what employment means? When a woman sits at a desk all day exercising general superintendence, is that employment? We have felt bound to restrict the employment of women in factories, because we know that, if they were worn out by it, when they married they would have very weak children, whom the State would probably have to maintain. But I know of no other ground of interference with the employment of adult women. We have only the right to interfere for the protection of the

*Mr. Sydney Gedge*

State. That is a very different matter to work in shops. Refreshment rooms are included in this Bill. In the Refreshment Room of this House young women serve us with tea, and, although they are busy at times, they have a very pleasant life at other times. It is the same at railway stations, and in City dining-rooms, where they work hard at breakfast, luncheon, and in the evening; but where, during the greater part of the day, there is very little for them to do. Yet those who employ them are to be subject to penalties. It is said the Workshop Hours Regulation Bill is not of much good, because we have not an army of Inspectors; but I suspect if there had been Inspectors poking their noses into the shops all over the country, you would have had such an outcry against that legislation; you could not have resisted. I am afraid that under this Bill you will have Inspectors making inquiries and stirring up cases against employers, and the result of such an obnoxious system would be a repeal of the law. The hon. Member thinks nothing of spending a few hundreds of thousands of pounds upon Inspectors; but think my constituents would look rather askance at me if I voted for such additional taxation as that. With regard to the Amendment, I demur to a proposition that this House will not legislate for the reasonable wants of any of Her Majesty's subjects until they have votes. Long before the agriculturists had votes the Conservatives had done all in their power for their benefit; and when complaints were made of defects in the law, it could not be forgotten that the Member for Midlothian and his Party have been in power during the greater part of the time which has elapsed since 1831. But we do not know what the wishes of women are, and we want to have them constitutionally expressed. The late Mr. Forster, as I remember, stated that he was not in favour of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of England being considered by Parliament until women had votes, because generally they had more to do with the clergy than men. If that were true on such a subject, how much more true is that argument when the Bill before us affects "only women."

It is because they will be materially injured by the restraint of this Bill that I am against it, and in favour of the Amendment. I am in favour of liberty all round, and while I heartily desire that no woman should have to work longer than this Bill provides, yet I hold we have no right to prevent a woman from working longer if she chooses to do so, and we have no right to interfere until we have ascertained her opinion. I beg to move that this House decline to further interfere with the hours of labour of adult women until women have the constitutional means of expressing their opinions by the Parliamentary Franchise.

#### Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "This House declines to further interfere with the hours of labour of adult women until women have the constitutional means of expressing their opinions by the Parliamentary Franchise."—(Mr. Sydney Gedge.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

(1.40.) MR. A. C. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston): I was much surprised, Sir, at the speech we have just listened to, and at the suggestion that legislation should be deferred till we have the enfranchisement of women. If we have any extension of the franchise which falls short of woman suffrage, the women for whom we plead would not be affected by it. The only objection that might be urged against the Bill is that what we want can be secured by voluntary effort. Any one familiar with the facts must realise that voluntary action will not adequately meet the case. As Chairman of the Board of the Early Closing Association, I have had special opportunity of making myself familiar with the facts bearing on that point. That Association has been in existence 50 years, and has spent £50,000 in endeavouring to cultivate voluntary early closing. If you consider the facts, you will find that those who have done most in the way of securing early closing are those who cry out most for legislative assistance in securing their object. If we desire to get early closing or a half-holiday in a district, we have to get the unanimous consent

young women employed at railway stations and other similar places. The hours are prolonged, and though the labour may not be continuous, the attendance is, and they have no opportunity of recreation or exercise in the open air, and they have many difficulties to contend with. I do not say that the House would be right in restricting their labour, but am of opinion that there is a *prima facie* case for inquiry by a Select Committee. Then there is the shop-keepers point of view. There may be wealthy shopkeepers, but as a class they are not such, and care must be exercised before the House take steps which might seriously embarrass them, harassed as they already are by the competition of Co-operative Stores and other causes. We must be careful how we interfere with freedom. There is such a thing as mischievous and damaging philanthropy, and some of our legislation approaches very near to that limit. We must be careful how far we restrain trade, how far we interfere with the convenience of the community, and how far we impose disabilities and difficulties upon a worthy and deserving class. I hope this Bill will be referred to a Select Committee, and investigated by that tribunal.

\*(2.40.) MR. ARTHUR B. WINTERBOTHAM (Gloucester): The House will have observed that every Member who sat upon the Committee of 1886, and who has spoken, has expressed approval of the provisions of this Bill, and gentlemen who went on that Committee, supposed to entertain a hostile aspect, could not resist the conclusion which the evidence brought before the Committee so clearly pointed out. I think that is an important matter. There has been a general unanimity by every speaker who has taken part in this discussion, with the exception of one discordant note struck by the hon. Member for Stockport. I do not propose to answer him, because there was no argument he used which would not apply with equal force to every one of the Factory Acts, for the regulation of the hours of labour, which this House has passed in former years. He spoke against the restriction of labour, and actually went so far as to say that it would tend to make women less

womanly! He spoke as if he were deeply anxious that there should be restraint in the hours of work; he fully admitted that the 74 hours' limit was ample, and he said he should be glad to see it brought about. But when he came to the question of the machinery to bring it about, and to carry his opinion into practice, then he fell back upon his admiration for voluntary work, and spoke about the results accomplished by a number of ladies in that regard. It is true there has been an Amendment moved to delay this legislation until Women's Suffrage has been passed; but I cannot understand anybody supporting that Amendment, whatever views hon. Members may hold upon the question of Woman's Suffrage. Those who oppose Woman's Suffrage, and who think that the House of Commons is ready, able, and even anxious to legislate for women, should be only too glad to support this Bill, so that they may give proof of what they profess. Those who think that the absence of women from the House is an explanation why women's interests and social questions generally are not sufficiently looked after, surely ought to be the last people to offer any stumbling-block or delay to the passing of this measure, which is for the advantage and benefit of a large class of the more helpless women of our country. I rise chiefly because, as an employer of female labour myself, I have been rather surprised at the arguments that have been used to-night about the oppression by employers; and I want to point out, to the great credit of the shopkeepers of this country, that the agitation that has been carried on in recent years, whether it has been for the weekly half-holiday, or for the shortening of the hours of labour, has had amongst its principal supporters the shopkeepers of this country. Speaking for Bristol and other large towns in the West, I believe there is a very general desire amongst all the better class of shopkeepers to carry out legislation of this sort. But it is always the selfish, grasping minority who stand in the way, and who are never happy unless they are getting the better of their fellow-men, and these men prevent the voluntary principle from being carried out. I believe

Mr. F. S. Powell

peak for employers of labour when I say that the Factory Acts have been of immense good to employers, and that you would get but a scanty return who would wish to go back to those days before the Factory Acts regulated the hours of labour; and I am sure it is a calumny on employers of labour to say that, as a class, they are opposed to the reasonable shortening of the hours of labour. Some hon. Member has said that the shopkeepers would look upon the power in the Bill in regard to inspectors in a more hostile spirit than the Inspectors appointed under the Factory Act; and I remember that the hon. Member for Stockport said that the Inspectors would "violate the sanctity" of the shop! It is absurd to talk about violating the sanctity of shops that are working their hands 80 or 90 hours a week, and in one case where I understand not less than 105 hours. I hold that in such cases the "sanctity" deserves to be violated. My own opinion is, that this Bill is so exceedingly reasonable and so exceedingly moderate that I should like it better if it went a little further. I believe that work in a shop is as hard on the average as in a factory, and I fail to see why the same number of hours per week should not be enforced as in the case of textile factories for women and children—namely, 55 and 56. During the past quarter of a century there has been great improvement in machinery; wonderful discoveries in science; we have had the telegraph, and telephone, and many other scientific discoveries; there have been great provisions made for the community in the way of improved locomotion. All these things have tended to increase the productiveness of labour, while machinery has enormously increased it. Of course, I know there will be people who will rejoice if the House is so foolish as to reject this proposal. This Bill does not propose to touch adult male labour; and I hold it is most moderate in all its provisions. For the last quarter of a century, as I have said, all these improvements in machinery have been enabling men who are in business to carry on business with great economy of labour, and with greater profit to

themselves; and the time has come when this demand for some part of the result in more leisure for the workers—a natural demand, a wise demand, and a right demand—should be fallen in with. The Bill does not largely affect those who live in country districts, but who reside in large and populous districts. The hours of labour are not unreasonable in country shops; but it is the daughters of the farmer and the labourer, who find their way to the great cities, who are interested, and there is not one of us who have not a constituency who are not regarding this question with the deepest interest. It is a great matter for the village girl when she comes to the city to have this matter legislated upon, and I submit that every Member of an agricultural constituency should take this view of it. The Member for Stockport used one argument, which I call the "mother argument," and that was that they would not produce such strong and healthy children. There is a stronger argument, not the argument of mere expediency and profit, but the Christian argument. We have the right and we have the responsibility to see that the weak should not work unreasonable hours; and if the hon. Member could prove to me that the longer the work of a woman the stronger and healthier she will be, and the stronger her children, then I could understand his contention. I hope this will be only the beginning of other Bills in the same direction to make the lives of women and children brighter and happier than they are.

\*(2.40.) MR. LEWIS H. ISAACS (Newington, Walworth): I wish to say that I cannot vote either for the Motion or for the Amendment. In the first instance, I do not think the Bill is in the right direction, and my reason for declining to support the Amendment is because I think it a most shabby attempt to set aside a Bill which has some merit in it by a proposal that it should be postponed, so as to fit in with another Bill not absolutely analogous to it or on all fours with it. I fail to see why a Bill to regulate the hours of shop labour should be deferred until this House has determined whether the franchise is to be conferred on women or not. That fran-

chise, if conferred, would not reach, at any rate in the present day, those who are immediately concerned in the Bill now under the consideration of the House. But if I am unable to support the Amendment, I regret that I am also unable to support the Motion "That the Bill be now read a second time." And perhaps the House will be somewhat startled if I say that my reason for not supporting the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill is that I do not think that it goes far enough, that it fails to deal with the class who are more immediately affected than those who are to come under the purview of this Bill, and that with regard to its inquisitorial character, that that inquisitorial character does not go far enough. I am of opinion that if there be one class of people more than another that should receive attention from this House with regard to the hours of labour in which they are engaged, it is the class of domestic servants. And I think we need only refer to our own establishments, and go no further back than yesterday to satisfy ourselves that if it is necessary at all to interfere in this direction the domestic servant has far more need of protection than even those for whom this Bill proposes to interfere. I remember last night, or rather this morning, getting to my house at something like 1 o'clock, and then not going to bed. The servants had to wait on me, and probably it was 2 o'clock in the morning before they got to bed, and they would have to resume their duties at 8 o'clock. I object to this Bill, also, because I think it interferes with what is a most salutary action on the part of the public, that is, the voluntary effort to reduce the hours of labour with which we are now dealing. If that voluntary effort be allowed to continue, I am sure it will eventually result in a satisfactory solution of this question. I may say that the Early Closing Association with which I am connected on the other side of the river, which has only one year's experience, held its first general meeting the other day, and they were able to make the announcement that by voluntary effort on the part of those interested, not by seeking to apply any coercion whatever, they had managed to get the result

*Mr. Lewis H. Isaacs*

sought for in the case of no less than 7,000 employes. And if the feeling in that direction be allowed to expand and be not interfered with by vexatious and troublesome and inquisitorial action such as that proposed by this Bill, it will in itself accomplish all that the promoters of this measure seek to obtain. I object, therefore, to further legislation in this direction. While unable to support the Amendment, I regret that I also am not in a position to give a vote to allow this Bill to go to a Second Reading.

(2.45.) MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I agree with one of the hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who said we ought not to mix up with this Bill the question of women suffrage. I think we should discuss this Bill on its merits, and not in reference to future questions of legislative reform. With another part of the hon. Member's speech I also heartily agree—namely, that this Bill is not intended to be a complete and final Bill with regard to all manner of employments. This Bill is only intended to deal with a certain description of employments. It is not a Bill which is intended to deal with every class of employment. But this I am bound to say, that there is this new principle involved in it which no doubt the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary will use as an objection to it—namely, that while in most of our coercive legislation in the past we have dealt with those persons employed in production, in this Bill we deal with those who are employed in distribution. But this Bill is divided into two parts; and I hope the House, if it cannot agree with that part of it affecting women labour, will, at all events, agree with that part of it which makes effective the measure introduced by the right hon. Member for the London University (Sir John Lubbock) a few years ago. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary will take this matter into his serious consideration, and as the House a few years ago definitely decided by a large majority that these young persons in shops should be protected, that he will now accept the means proposed by my hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Provand) to make that proposal really

otive; and as regards the latter of the Bill, which, in my mind, in no way more or less extends the principle of interference with women out to shops for the first time, I believe he will also assent to that principle as well. I am not going to trouble the House with the particulars which have been already given in reference to the absolute necessity there is for further legislation in respect to this matter. But there is one great advantage which this Bill has over other Bills which have been brought before the House, namely, its considerable elasticity.

A great objection to the Bill introduced by the right hon. Baronet behind the Shop Hours Bill—was that it provided a fixed closing hour for every day in the week.

MR. JOHN LUBBOCK: That was the Shop Hours Bill; it was the original Closing Bill.

MR. S. BUXTON: Yes. It was suggested by hon. Members on the ground that it provided that there should be fixed hours for closing instead of leaving to the different trades a certain amount of elasticity for working it out. This Bill provides the maximum number of hours in a week should be 74. The hon. Member for Wigan said there had been a great deal of exaggeration in regard to the number of hours worked by women in shops; but I think he will agree that 74 hours a week is sufficient, further hours than that can be provided. These 74 hours can be spread over the week in the way best suited to the particular trades and peculiar localities; therefore, the argument that it is too hard-and-fast cannot be urged against this Bill. The hon. Member for Wigan said he should be very careful in reference to this matter, because we must not injure the trades of shops;

I think that was completely answered by the very admirable speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow when he pointed out that, after all, there is no foreign competition in connection with this matter. It seems to me that the great advantage of this will be that it will take a step further in the right direction; that it will see that the Act of a few years ago in reference to these young

persons, is properly carried out; and be a first step in further restriction in regard to the hours of those employed in shops. I think it is perfectly clear, from what I have heard from previous speakers, that the bulk of the women themselves are in favour of this proposal. No doubt the Home Secretary will use the argument which he used over and over again when we were discussing the Factory Acts—namely, that he is not prepared to take the responsibility on his shoulders; that his Inspectors were not prepared to undertake such labour as this. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary has a very considerable number of Inspectors to carry out the present Factory and Workshops Act. Last year we put aside from the Home Office a great deal of the responsibility in reference to the workshops, in regard to sanitary and other conditions, and I say that to add this particular duty to those already existing will not be throwing too heavy a burden upon him, and I believe it will be carried out with considerable ease. I firmly believe, also, that the employers themselves will be very glad of legislation of this sort, as my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow has said. I think voluntary closing may be possible in certain country districts and small towns, but it is impossible in very large towns and large cities; whereas, if the employers themselves were on terms of equality with regard to hours of closing, they would gladly carry out such an Act as this.

\*(2.50.) VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen): I had the honour of being a member of the Grand Committee which dealt very closely with the Factory Acts last Session. I do not propose to support the Amendment, as I cannot understand why we should mix this question up with so intricate a matter as women suffrage, which divides this House, not merely by Party lines, but into fragments. The matter on which I propose to make a few remarks is with respect to the clause which includes women in the purview of this Bill. I fully admit that it very possibly, and very probably, is the case, that there are many women employed in shops who live a life of great hardship, which we should all de-

sire to mitigate as far as we can; and I cannot say that it would be contrary to the spirit of former legislation to do so, because with the Factory Acts staring us in the face—in which this House and Parliament has agreed to limit the hours of labour of adult women in factories—there is no reason why we should not extend that principle to the limiting of their labour in shops. But I have had representations made to me, not only last year, but this, on behalf of the women themselves, who are unwilling that such legislation should be passed. And the reason they allege—rightly or wrongly—and I am far from pretending that I have sufficient knowledge to pronounce upon it—but the reason they allege is that if the hours are limited, in many cases it will be the custom of owners and shop proprietors to dispense with women labour altogether, and employ none but men. Now, in my judgment, and, I think, in the judgment of the House, it would be better that these women should work, and work too hard, than not work at all; it would be better they should earn wages—even that they should endure a great deal of hardship—than that they and their families should be deprived of this money, which goes to keep the house over them, and to keep themselves and their families. And there is no one who was present at the Debates of the Grand Committee last year but will bear me out when I say that this matter is a very important one. There was a speech delivered by an hon. Gentleman in the Grand Committee which to me let in a flood of light upon this question. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green, whom I do not see in his place at this moment, speaking with respect to women labour—not in regard to shops, but in regard to women labour in the chain-making districts of Staffordshire—urged as one of the reasons why the hours should be limited that, even if it led to the cessation of women labour altogether, it would raise the wages of the men. It was not cynically said; he believed it would be an advantage to the community at large even if women did not work at all, if the wages of the men could be raised. I say that is a principle we cannot assent to, and have no right

*Viscount Cranborne*

to assent to. These women are given by Providence powers for work and earning money, and they have every right to use them, and we have no right to restrain them from earning what they can for the common good. I believe that is the view of the hon. Member for Bethnal Green and the hon. Member for Poplar. I believe the hon. Member for Poplar would be only too glad if he could have stopped women's work altogether.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No, no.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Well, at any rate he is in favour of the restriction of their hours of labour, and he would be inclined to restrict the hours of labour of men as well as women. I do not at all agree with the arguments applied to the matter of the restraint of the hours of labour used by hon. Members opposite, and therefore I cannot support this Bill at the present stage. But no doubt the matter is full of interest, and it would be a public benefit if some method could be devised whereby in many hard cases of overwork on the part of these unfortunate women some remedy could be applied; and therefore I confess that I welcome the Motion which has been put upon the Paper in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London, that this matter should be referred to a Select Committee. I have no fear of the result of the Select Committee. I believe the result of the Select Committee would show the essential difficulty of dealing with this subject, but it might be fruitful in some suggestion which might benefit these unfortunate women.

\*(3.4.) MR. THOMAS HENRY BOLTON (St. Pancras, N.): I hardly like to give a silent vote upon this Bill as I have some difficulty in dealing with it. As the noble Lord has said the subject is full of interest, and is one appealing very strongly to our sympathies. I do not suppose anyone suggests that the legislation in reference to young persons should be repealed. I believe the general feeling is that this legislation should be re-considered, with the view of making it practically effective and if the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the

University of London were carried out, and the Bill referred to a Select Committee, that Committee would no doubt primarily turn their attention to the legislation with reference to young persons, as to how in any way it could be strengthened so as to give full effect to it. But the Bill presents very serious difficulties in connection with the limitation of the hours of labour of women employed in shops. Of course, we all sympathise very much with these women, who, in many cases, are not very strong in health, who labour very many hours in very tedious employment in shops. But how far we are justified in prohibiting the employment of women—who have just as much right to be employed as men—beyond a certain period of time, and placing them to that extent at a disadvantage with men, is another and a much more serious question. I doubt very much whether there has been any strong expression of opinion by any large number of women with reference to this matter; and no legislation of this kind could be justified, much less enforced, unless there were a very strong popular feeling behind it. This Bill proposes not only to prohibit the employment of women in shops, but “about” shops—“in and about shops.” I do not know what is meant exactly by that word “about,” but I think that expression has a very extensive, and may have a very sweeping effect. The Bill defines a shop. It includes a retail as well as a wholesale shop, a market stall, a warehouse, and licensed public-house, and refreshment house of any kind. There may be very good reasons for limiting the hours of labour, if practicable, in factories and wholesaleshops; but when you come to carry that still further to retail shops and places where a few persons are employed, many of them with the members of the family in the same house, I think you are making a proposition of extreme difficulty. Many of these employments are employments that are not continuous during the whole day; they are intermittent. Take, for instance, the case of refreshment houses, where women are largely employed. There is a press of business in the middle of the day in certain

quarters of the City, and after that there is comparatively very little to be done. In the West-End they are not so busy in the early part of the day, but very busy in the later part of the day. Again, in the suburban shops there are periods in the day when they are busy, and when almost all the business is done. But if you, without any qualification, apply to those shops a sweeping law of this kind, it will be a strong thing. Again, Sir, there are many highly-paid women in West-End shops who are obliged, at certain seasons of the year, to work almost night and day. For the remainder of the year they have comparatively little to do. Is it desirable that they should be interfered with? I have no particular hesitation in dealing with the large places of business; but I desire to say a word in favour of that numerous class of struggling shopkeepers whose business will not admit of them keeping a large and qualified staff of assistants. I feel, as strongly as anybody can do, against the overwork in shops, but I am not prepared to go in advance of public opinion. I think the Bill should be read a second time, as most of us agree with a portion of it, and should go to a Committee; but it should go free from any influence or sanction on the part of this House. The Committee can take evidence, and I hope that some practical result will be the outcome of its labours.

\*(3.15.) MR. J. R. KELLY (Camberwell, N.): In the absence of any sufficient indication of opinion on the part of the large section of the community more immediately concerned, I do not think the Government can, or ought, to support this Bill. What do the shop girls and the small shopkeepers think about it? That is what we want to know. As regards the Amendment upon the Paper, I was certainly astonished it should have found its way there; but I confess I was astounded that it should have been moved by my hon. Friend the Member for Stockport. It is a women's suffrage Amendment, and what do the few widows and scatter-brained spinsters, who are ratepayers, know of the wishes of tens of thousands of girls in humble life? How are they to know



them? I was astounded to find the names of the hon. Members for Stockport, St. Helen's, and the Accrington Division of Lancashire on the back of the Bill. I should like to know what the small shopkeepers in their constituencies have to say to it. I should also like to know what the small shopkeepers all over England will have to say to it? The hon. Member for Peckham said—"We must compel the shopkeepers to treat their assistants with humanity." What does this involve, but a wholly unjustifiable charge against all who keep shop-assistants? Now, Sir, I should like to say that I have gone into hundreds of shops for the purpose of ascertaining whether they were in favour of early closing, and I found that it is not the shopkeepers who are to blame for the shops being kept open late, but the public who will not shop early. Induce the public to shop early, and there will be no necessity whatever for this Bill. Sir, the hon. Member for Peckham made use of an argument respecting the profits of shopkeepers, which I think he ought not to have employed, for it was practically that this House ought not to refuse to pass the Bill because those profits would be diminished. What does this House care about the profits of shopkeepers? In the suburbs of London, as I can tell him, there are very few shopkeepers who employ more than one assistant, and generally she has some claim upon them—either because she is a family connection, or for some other reason, and I know she is not treated as a servant would be treated by his master, but really as a member of his family. Moreover, I can say that, so far from making enormous fortunes, 999 out of every 1,000 shopkeepers find it a very difficult thing to live, and to make both ends meet. Sir, some astonishment has been expressed to my knowledge, as to why some servants are included in this Bill. If hon. Members will turn to the Definition Clause, they will find that the Bill will include all the cases of hotels. This Bill is so recklessly drawn that the kitchenmaids, and the chambermaids, after a certain number of hours will have to be turned into the street, until the time comes for them to return to go to bed. There is an invitation to

the employers to do that, for the person must not be in or about a shop, or in or about an hotel, and the hotelkeeper could not escape conviction and punishment under this Bill, unless he turned his poor girls into the street for some hours at night. There is great force in what has been said by the noble and learned Member for Darwen. Women feel that there is a disposition to drive them altogether from employment. They claim, and I think they have a right to claim, to be at liberty to sell their labour when they like, to whom they like, and for what they like. So far as the Shop Hours Regulation Act goes, we have no objection to its renewal. We will vote for its being made perpetual at any moment. If that Act was properly enforced—and there is no reason why it should not be—there would be ample protection given to those who ought to be protected. Women of 18 years and upwards do not desire to be treated as children, and they ought to be allowed to go into the market and make their own terms. If this Bill passed, the first effect would be to compel small tradesmen to consider whether they should have assistants or not, and this would mean that wages would be reduced. But, Sir, I say that until there has been some real demand on the part of those for whom it is sought to legislate, the House should not allow the Bill to pass. The shopkeepers, so far as we know, are not in favour of this Bill, though, of course, they would be only too glad to limit the hours during which they are now obliged to keep their shops open. But until we have some knowledge of the feelings of those who will be affected, I hope the House will not allow this Bill to be advanced.

MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: May I say that, with the permission of the House, I will withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

(3.33.) MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): The hon. Member for Camberwell seemingly spent a great deal of time in making observations in regard to the feelings of shopkeepers in relation to this question.

*Mr. J. R. Kelly*

**MR. KELLY:** My inquiries, which were conducted two or three years ago, had reference to the early closing movement.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** Then the hon. Member introduced a matter which had no reference to this question at all, but something which occurred two or three years ago.

**MR. KELLY:** Will the hon. Member again pardon me? The subject was not introduced by me, but by one of the Members for Glasgow, who spoke at considerable length upon it.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** Well, I am not aware of the reason of the interruption, because I do not think there is any difference between us. I look upon this subject with a very great amount of jealousy. I am as much in favour of liberty as the hon. Member for Camberwell can be. But the Home Secretary knows that when he was dealing with the Workshops Act a year ago, I took the liberty of expressing to the right hon. Gentleman that he should deal with the hours of shops. In the workshops there is more difficulty about the visitations of Inspectors than in the case of sale shops. In the case of sale shops nobody has found the slightest fault with the intrusion of Inspectors, who are always courteous and who often make valuable suggestions in regard to matters of importance. A good deal was said by the hon. Member for Camberwell with regard to young women, and I maintain that to allege that the class of women who receive employment at our counters are going out, as he insinuated in an infamous way, into the streets is a slander.

**MR. KELLY:** I beg pardon; I said nothing of the kind. What I said was, that if this Bill passed it would force hotel-keepers to drive their servants to the streets.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** What does the hon. Member mean by driving them to the streets?

**MR. KELLY:** The hon. Member must not make me say that. It is not fair. I said precisely the opposite. I said one danger of this Bill was, that it was so recklessly drawn that if it were applied, as it must be, to domestic servants of hotels, I do not see how an

hotel-keeper could help being summoned unless he drove his people out on the streets.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** I shall not again give way to the interruption of the hon. Member; but I repeat, and I am in the recollection of the House, that the hon. Member emphasised it again and again, that the consequence of passing this Bill would be to drive those young women on to the streets. No other deduction could be made from the statement of the hon. Member for Camberwell. He has not withdrawn that statement.

**MR. KELLY:** Will the hon. Member permit me—(Cries of "Order!")—the hon. Member has challenged me—(Renewed cries of "Order!")

**MR. SPEAKER:** I hope the Debate will be continued without personal altercations between the two hon. Gentlemen.

**MR. ESSLEMONT:** I am the last Member of this House to engage in an altercation; but I must respectfully enter my protest against the hon. Member for Camberwell making any statement which would imply that the passing of this Bill would in any way undermine the virtue of the persons who are at present engaged in shops. I challenge the Member for Camberwell to bring any proof that young women in shops desire to work more than 74 hours a week. My objection to the Bill is that it contains Clause 10; but I shall vote for the Second Reading, in order that it may go before a Select Committee.

(3.48.) **MR. C. GRAY** (Maldon, Essex): I am not at present convinced that those of us who sympathise with the large class of young ladies who come up from the country and are employed in the large towns would not show that sympathy in a more marked way if they were to vote for the Second Reading, and relegate the question to a Committee, rather than if they refused a Second Reading, and relegated the question to a party that perhaps would be altogether beyond the control of this Parliament. I want this question to be looked into as speedily as possible. We have heard from the noble Lord the Member for Darwen and others, to whom this House always listens with

respect, that if this Bill becomes law female labour would be hardly wanted in the labour market. But there is a good deal these ladies do which could not be done by the male sex, and there is not the slightest danger that the Bill, after going through a careful sifting in a Select Committee, would be put on the Statute Book in such a form as to prevent the employment of ladies in those businesses for which they are pre-eminently adapted. The hon. Member for Camberwell challenged us to produce any evidence from the ladies themselves as to this legislation being wanted. If he had seen, as I have seen on many occasions, the daughters of our farmers, in counties near London, coming up rosy and stalwart girls, and then, after a few months of these long hours, going back home with all the roses gone from their cheeks, he would say there was evidence which should not be treated lightly. In the interests of country girls I beg the House to read this Bill a second time.

\*(3.53.) SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University: I congratulate the hon. Member for Glasgow on having secured the first place for his Bill on this occasion. I think the House will agree that this is one of the most important questions that could be brought before us, and it is remarkable that no single Member who has spoken has distinctly intimated his intention of going so far as to vote against the Second Reading. The hon. Member for Walworth criticised the Bill as not going far enough, but let us invite him to go with us as far as it goes. The hon. Member for Camberwell spoke of the evils of the proposal as affecting public-houses. He could not have been aware that it is at present the law, so far as young persons are concerned; and, therefore, if the evils he foresaw are likely to ensue, they would have occurred already, so far as young persons are concerned. The change now proposed, so far as public-houses are concerned, is, that the law, in regard to young persons, should be extended to women. The hon. Member said there was no demand for any legislation as regards shops,

*Mr. C. Gray*

and challenged the Member for Peckham on the point. I am unable to say what is the opinion there, but in the neighbouring district of Dulwich, inquiry has shown that 95 per cent. of the shopkeepers in the poorest quarters were in favour of some legislation. This is not a question between class and class, nor between employer and employed; and having attended a large number of meetings in favour of legislation for shop hours, I say unhesitatingly that the shopkeepers are almost as anxious as the assistants for some such legislation. In Liverpool, a few years ago, a circular was sent out to 2,000 shopkeepers, and it was found that 1,770 were in favour of legislation, and only 200 against it. The editor of the *Chemist and Druggist* sent out a circular to the chemists of the country, and received answers from 2,000, showing that 1,330 of that number were in favour of legislation and only 600 against it. Until within the last few years the Early Closing Association themselves were opposed to all such legislation; but they were so struck by the evidence of the Committee, over which I had the honour to preside in 1886, that they took steps to ascertain the feelings of several thousand shopkeepers in the poorest districts of London, and found there was a very large majority of them who wished for some legislation. There has never yet been a meeting of shopkeepers in London or in any great city which has opposed legislation on the subject. One was called for the purpose, which I attended in the South of London, but it ended by passing a unanimous resolution in favour of our Half-Holiday Bill. I believe it would be popular with the shopkeepers if Her Majesty's Government could see their way to allow this Bill to be read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee. As regards the feeling of customers, it is important that the Trade Council of London, as well as those of Glasgow and elsewhere, have passed unanimous resolutions asking the House to deal with this evil. I had the honour, two or three years ago, of presenting a petition, signed by the Presidents of the College of Surgeons and Physicians, Sir J.

met, and most of the other leaders of the medical profession, and more than 300 medical men practising in London, calling attention to the fact that the health of shop-women was suffering terribly. I have also presented their petitions signed, amongst others, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, several other Bishops, and several hundred clergymen, as well as by Cardinal Manning, and by a large portion of the Roman Catholic priests of London, and by many Dissenting ministers of the metropolis, praying this House to pass some legislation, because, at present, small shopkeepers and their assistants have no opportunity or time for religious offices. The evidence we had before us in Committee was very strong, to the effect that work in shops was often more exhausting than even in factories. I think, however, the noble Lord the Member for Darwen made a very sensible speech on this subject, and I believe that the House would act wisely and prudently if it were to refer this matter to a Select Committee, which would take evidence, and I, for one, should be glad, to a certain extent, to suspend my judgment as to the proposal to extend this present Act to women. At the same time, I feel that the necessity for some interference is so great that I hope the House will refer the Bill, in order that we may examine the matter and take evidence. The second main point is the question of the appointment of Inspectors to carry out the provisions of the Shop Hours Regulation Act of 1886. That Act has done a great amount of good, it has done much to diminish the long hours of labour for boys and girls, but I never did think it would entirely meet that great evil. I should like the Committee to have power to deal with that point also. We are told that a whole army of Inspectors will be necessary, and thousands of pounds will have to be spent on them, but I do not think so at all. I believe that a much smaller measure than that suggested opposite might effect the whole object. Only yesterday, in the evidence of the Licensed Victuallers before the Committee on the Hours of

Labour, it was said that the hours of barmaids were very much exaggerated, they were not 100, but only 81 a week; surely that is a great deal too much. When the Early Closing Association hears of a case of long hours, there is great difficulty in getting the evidence in a form they can take into a Court of Law; the boy or girl, and the parents also, are reluctant to offer testimony, because it means unpleasantness between them and the employer. But if they could go to the Inspector quietly, and he could then go to the employer and say that he had reason to believe that young persons were employed there longer than was authorised by law, that would often lead to the remedying of the state of affairs. The number of prosecutions under the Act is no measure of the good it has done, because in many cases the employer shortens the hours when his attention is called to the matter. If, however, a few Inspectors were appointed, the Early Closing Association might go to one of them and say, "We have reliable evidence that the Act is not being complied with in such and such an establishment, will you inquire into the matter?" The Inspector would inquire for himself, and there would be nothing more invidious than in the case of the Factory Acts. I should propose, therefore, with the consent of my hon. Friend, if the Bill be read a second time, to move that it be referred to a Select Committee. If we do that, it will be a step which will be heartily supported by the vast majority of shopkeepers in the country. No hon. Member has expressed any doubt that thousands and thousands of shop assistants and small shopkeepers are being employed for 80 to 90 hours a week, and that is incompatible with maintaining the health of the population. Surely, this House, when the facts are brought before it, will make an effort to alter the state of things; they will not put this Bill on one side and say, We will not allow it to be inquired into. I would implore the House and the Government to let the Bill be read a second time and referred to a Select Committee: in that case the House will earn the gratitude of

thousands of our countrymen and women, and have passed a piece of legislation which will be most enduring and beneficent in its effects.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): This is one of those measures in which the Government does not think necessary to intervene between the Mover and the House, and in the few observations I am about to make I am stating my own opinion, and not the opinion of the Government. As an individual Member of the House, such opinions as I have been able to form from the materials before me are certainly not favourable to the Bill. I quite agree that the hours of labour have been reduced in factories and workshops, and the argument is, why not go a step further and reduce the hours in shops? Because if they did that, some philanthropist would come forward and say, why not reduce the hours of labour in private houses? You deal here with the labours of women in a way in which you have not dealt with it in the Factory Acts. You had a general rule for the limitation of hours, but that was subject to many exceptions, and you introduced a provision allowing overtime in cases of pressure of work, and other cases. No shop assistant or shopkeeper is allowed by this Bill the slightest latitude in cases of emergency, such as are provided in the Factory Acts. In those Acts there are exceptional cases of overtime, such as the case of the Jews, which are dealt with. I belong to the exploded school of Individualism, which the hon. Member for Peckham derided. I am still old-fashioned enough to think that those who desire to shorten the hours of labour of adult persons, male or female, ought to make out an overwhelming case in their favour. I should be extremely sorry if the House were to adopt a slipshod mode of procedure, and say, We have restricted labour in one direction, and we are going to do it in every other. The only ground I have heard urged in favour of this Bill is the medical ground. It was said that the hours worked by women in shops were so injurious that the House ought to inter-

*Sir John Lubbock*

fere on the ground of health. I cannot contradict that on my own personal knowledge, but in such documents as I have access to there is no evidence to support that view. In the Report of the Committee of 1886, to which so much reference has been made, there is nothing to show that the hours of labour of young women in shops—hours long and excessive, if you please—produced such injurious effects on their health as to form a fitting basis and ground for legislation in this House. It is true there was one medical man, the retained official of the Early Closing Association, Dr. Abbott, cited by the Mover of the Bill, who appeared to think that the work in a shop was more fatiguing and put greater strain on the feminine system than did work in a factory. The machinery in the latter was always the same, while in the former the customers were numerous and their humours variable. I do not think that many medical men will agree that a woman spending ten hours before a spinning-jenny—a machine requiring extreme watchfulness, and in a constant go and whirl—is not worked harder than one who waited on those whose tastes in ribbons were difficult to satisfy. The independent doctors who were called before the Committee of 1886 confined their observations to the cases of growing girls between the ages of 15 and 21—"young people" said one, "girls under 18" said another. They were the people in whose cases arose physical injury in consequence of the long hours kept in many of the shops of the country. I cannot find any evidence in regard to adult women. I applied to the Registrar General, and asked him whether he could throw any light on the question, and whether the mortality of shop assistants was higher than that of other classes of the population, and the information I received was, that no material exists for making any positive statement on the subject. If anybody asserts that shop women suffer in excess of other women, and have shorter lives, I should like to know the basis on which they found the assertion. According to my evidence it is mere supposition. If hon. Members will turn to

the last Report of the Registrar General they will find, it is true, no statistics relating to women, but the shopkeepers and the men employed as assistants are lumped together, and they have a lower mortality than any other occupations. Therefore the medical ground, which, so far as I know, is the only ground for supporting this legislation—exceptional, though not unprecedented—is not even. That it is an interference with the labour of adult men and women it is impossible to deny. I do not feel, I confess, as to what extent this Bill, if passed, will interfere with the legitimate and proper employment of women, but I feel that it would tend to largely displace women from those classes of labour which they now occupy. There are shops in which you cannot dispense with the women assistants, but there are many shops, warehouses, markets, stalls, public-houses, and refreshment houses where you might well dispense with their services altogether; and I feel that in such cases they would be largely displaced by men, and mainly by foreigners. The hon. Member for Poplar, who knows the factory legislation and its effect to this country, will at once see the embarrassment of the case if a Factory Inspector had to decide when a young woman, employed, say, at an hotel, was at work. Is she at work when she is dawdling about waiting for a bell to ring? That would always arise when you are dealing with intermittent and non-continuous employment.

MR. S. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): We, on this side, are agreed that the Bill should go to a Select Committee, in order that these points should there be dealt with.

MR. MATTHEWS: I cannot help thinking that the Bill will seriously interfere with trade, and for that I have not heard a sufficient reason advanced. I do not know whether the House has noticed the fact that the figures quoted are from our side and the Early Closing Association, arrived in a new cause. This House rejected the Early Closing Bill by a majority of three to one; but in a speech made earlier in the day by the hon.

Member for the Tradeston Division it was frankly admitted and avowed that this is an Early Closing Bill, the object of which is to bring about the simultaneous closing at an early hour of all the shops in the country. I do not know if hon. Members have altered their minds on that point; I have not, and should be prepared to vote against early closing, as on previous occasions. I suppose that no one would suggest that a small shopkeeper should have one assistant to attend during the earlier hours of business and another to attend during the later hours. We all know the conditions under which the small shops are kept open; if they were not, the customers would be discontented. Therefore, you must either have discontent or the shift system. Those leviathan establishments against which the hon. Member for Peckham directed what I must think were valedictory sarcasms—on the undue wealth which was to be squeezed out of them—will not be touched by this Bill. Take Marshall and Snelgrove's, and those great establishments, they are not open twelve hours in a day; they do not begin till 10, and are all shut up at 7. The persons who would be affected are the small struggling tradesmen in the suburbs, who painfully works to gain a slight livelihood out of the business done with his poor customers in the early hours of the morning before they go to work, and in the late hours of the evening when they come back. I have seen statements by working men as to how impossible it would be for them to get home, have their supper, and get their shopping done before closing time if an Early Closing Bill were passed. One word I must say on the question of the machinery of the Bill. Again, my hon. Friend the Member for Peckham welcomes the idea of an army of Inspectors, and hundreds of thousands of pounds being spent upon the working of the Bill. I would ask the House to consider seriously, from the taxpayers' point of view, what would be the pecuniary result of a measure which must necessarily apply to every petty huckster's shop, warehouse, stall, and market

throughout the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. And, speaking of Ireland, I must say that I am sorry the Members for Ireland have not raised their voice in the course of this Debate, as I am sure I know very little about the retail shop trade in Ireland, or of the conditions under which it is carried on; and, therefore, in the absence of the hon. Members who represent Ireland, I am unable to say how the measure would affect that part of the country. If this Bill were passed, every one of the shops I have mentioned would have to be visited by Inspectors appointed and controlled by the Government, and this, I believe, to be impracticable. Again, let me refer to the interesting speech of the hon. Member for the Tradeston Division of Glasgow, who, I am sorry to see, has left his place. He told us, as the Chairman of a large Association that is active in the matter of early closing, of a prosecution instituted against the employers of a young boy of 14 years having failed. Why did it fail? Because he said it was very difficult to get a lad so circumstanced to give evidence against his employer, as he did not wish to lose his situation. That is the great difficulty. Do you think the Inspector under this Bill would have any magic wand which would compel women to give evidence? Those are the very difficulties we have to deal with under the Factory Act, and you cannot suppose it easier for an Inspector to detect cases of over-work in shops than it would be under the present Factory Act. I believe that unless a Factory Inspector remained on the premises all day it would be impossible for him to detect whether, in particular cases, the prescribed number of hours had been exceeded or not; so that in that respect the Bill would be only a failure, and I should be sorry to see it passed. I would most strenuously urge upon the House not to throw upon a Government Department such a task, as I believe no Government Department would be equal to the burden. When it is said that these Inspectors would not be more annoying to the shopkeeper than they are to the owner of a factory, I confess I

*Mr. Matthews*

cannot accept the suggestion, nor do I see the truth of the observation. What is the Inspector to pursue his inquiry? When is he to enter the shop? During the business hours, when the shop is open to customers? Imagine what would be the effect on the customers if an Inspector came in during business hours, called away young women engaged behind counters, and proceeded to enter upon inquiries as to the hours of employment. Is it suggested that that would not be an annoyance; that it would not be highly resented both by the shopkeeper and the customer? All these things seem to me not to have been very much considered by the framers of the Bill, and they seem to me to add to the matter considerable difficulty. These are grounds which incline me personally to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill; but, on the other hand, if the House is of opinion that this is a subject upon which inquiry can throw useful light, I should be very sorry to oppose that inquiry. It seems to me immaterial whether we read the Bill a second time and refer it to a Select Committee, or whether the Bill is withdrawn and we appoint a Hybrid Committee to inquire into the subject. I hope the inquiry may be useful; I am sure it will be interesting; and I, for one, would not be disposed personally to resist inquiry either by a Select Committee or by a Hybrid Committee. But, while consenting to such a course, I must, however, carefully guard both myself and the Government from any suggestion that we are assenting to the principle, and still less to the details, of the Bill before the House. When the Inquiry of 1886 took place nobody proposed at that time to go into these provisions, and it would, in my opinion, be most rash on the part of the House of Commons to embark on this legislation without the fullest inquiry being made in regard to those new provisions, as they would affect every part of the Kingdom. The inquiry would be an experiment, and an interesting one, I am sure. The result may possibly change the feeling, both on the part of shop assistants and shopkeepers, but, certainly, until I am convinced by the results of an inquiry of that sort, I

st decline to support the Bill, and I reserve my consent either to its principles or to its details.

4.35.) MR. WALTER S. B. LAREN (Cheshire, Crewe) : I move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months. I confess I vote very strongly upon this Bill myself, but, of course, for my part, if it had been limited to young persons of not over 21 years of age, I should have opposed the Second Reading. I would, in my opinion, be most unwilling to embark on legislation of this kind without the very fullest inquiry. I am strengthened upon this point with great assurance by the speech of the Home Secretary, and agree with him that if we pass the Second Reading, and if, by the Second Reading, we are to affirm the principle of the Bill; we should be entering upon a course of legislation of a very serious character. But a Second Reading would affirm the principle of it, which principle is this, that women should not work more than a certain number of hours; and to pass the Second Reading without inquiry into that principle, without ascertaining at all whether it would be a good thing to do or the reverse, would, I think, be putting the cart before the horse. By all means let the Bill be considered, and let the inquiry be made. I have already got a Royal Commission sitting upon this very question. I have a Royal Commission sitting on the Labour Question, and that Royal Commission is about to appoint lady Sub-Commissioners to deal with this very branch of the Labour Question; and, under those circumstances, it would be a most ridiculous thing to ask the House, while that Commission is sitting, and when it is about to appoint lady Sub-Commissioners, to forestall the judgment of the Commissioners. The speech of the Member for Aberdeen was practically a speech in favour of the general closing movement. Very little in the speech of the right hon. Baronet the Member for London University was directed to the principle of this Bill. It was directed principally to early closing. There is a great deal to be said for general early closing;

but the early closing movement applies to men and women alike, and it is therefore free from the strongest objection which can be urged against this Bill—namely, that if it became law it would exclude from employment a very large number of women. The hon. Member for Aberdeen argued that excessive hours should not prevail anywhere, and the right hon. Baronet the Member for London University spoke almost entirely about the necessity for early closing legislation; but let it be borne in mind that if they pass this Bill they do not ensure early closing at all. It simply, in other words, means this: that, in the competition amongst shops, those shops that employ men only can keep open as long as they like, and get all the late customers, which would be so valuable to them; while those employing women would have to close early, because it would not be worth while to keep their shops open when, say, two-thirds of their *employées*, who would be women, had gone home. This would give a great advantage to any establishment that employed only men. There is a desire upon the part of small shopkeepers to keep open longer than this Bill would allow them, as they wish to accommodate late customers, and the direct result would be that these small shopkeepers would at once dismiss all their female hands, and dispense with female labour. I think, therefore, this is a very serious thing for the House to legislate upon, without having any evidence before it that this is desired by women. I admit that the hours are long—in a great many cases they are far too long—and I have no desire to see them so long as they are. I would support the Early Closing Bill, because it is an optional Bill with regard to where it may be put into force; and, secondly, because it would not necessitate the discharge of women, but deals fairly with both sexes. I believe there is no evidence that women desire this; there has been no effort made to obtain it. It might be obtained by a Committee, and I think it will be obtained by the Royal Commission. I dare say if you go to a number of shop assistants and ask them whether they prefer to work



74 hours to working 80 hours, they will say "Yes"; but if they were asked whether they preferred being paid for 74 hours to being paid for 80 hours they would say "No." Wages will be reduced as the hours are reduced, and I certainly think that one of the direct results of this Bill would be that the wages of women and girls would be reduced; and, for this simple reason, that I believe that a large number of women would be dismissed in consequence of the passing of the Bill. These women, being thrown out of their employment, would compete in the labour market with others, and the result would be that the wages would go down. Now we desire to raise the wages of women, and that cannot be done by increasing competition of women among themselves, but by removing all artificial restrictions to their employment. This Bill has not been brought before the women of the country; it has not been submitted to them, and there are very few women in the country that have the slightest idea that it is before Parliament; therefore, you are asked to deal with the liberty of women to sell their labour in open market, without these women having been consulted. Not a Member of this House has authority for saying that he knows the women of this country are in favour of this measure. This is a principle of legislation I entirely disapprove of, and it is not the way in which Bills dealing with labour should be submitted to this House. This is not the way in which similar questions affecting other persons have been approached by the House. We had the opinion of the miners of the country taken for and against the Eight Hours Bill affecting the miners' hours of labour. I do not know, and the House does not know, the opinion of women upon this subject; yet the House is invited to legislate in entire ignorance of their views. I can only suppose that the reason is that the House has always classified women and children together; but I think we are not entitled to interfere with the working of women unless we know that it is the strong desire of the women of the country that we

*Mr. Walter S. B. M'Laren*

should do so. I put down an Amendment upon the Paper which was moved in my absence, and which has been withdrawn; but I desire to say that it is my opinion it would not be desirable to further control the hours of female labour until we have the views of women expressed by the election of Members to this House. If there were some other equally efficacious means of ascertaining their opinion, it might be another matter. During the passing of the Mines Regulation Act the House was invited to prevent women working at the pits' brow, and they declined to do so. In the Factory and Workshops Act the House was again asked to interfere in regard to the chainmakers, and the House again rejected the proposal; and therefore I ask the House to reject this Bill, and follow out the conduct they have adopted on two other occasions, as I believe this very important matter will not suffer by being left over for further inquiry, and until the House is satisfied by further inquiry, it would not be right to pass it into law.

MR. SPEAKER: I ask if any hon. Gentleman seconds it.

SIR J. C. COLOMB (*Tower Hamlets*): I will, Sir.

(5.45.) Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Walter M'Laren.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

(4.55.) MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (*St. Helen's*): I have listened with great attention to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and to what I may call the humanity argument he advanced. It seems to me that what the right hon. Gentleman said was a very strong reason for the passing of the Second Reading of this Bill, and surely a Select Committee is the right tribunal to examine into these things. I have listened to a good many speeches upon this question; amongst others, I listened with some attention to the remarks of the hon. Member for Camberwell. I find myself unable to agree with the hon. Member in the argu-

ments he advanced against the Bill. The hon. Member said there was a very easy remedy, for shop assistants could readily go into domestic service, where they could get employment and secure a means of livelihood. I never heard a more extraordinary argument advanced. How could you say to one class of women, who were brought up to the shop system, go into domestic service, which is a wholly different sort of employment? I think very few people would employ as a domestic servant a person who had no training or that kind of work, but for work of a totally different kind. Another objection of the hon. Member for Camberwell was that in regard to the application of the Bill to hotels. The hotel proprietors would have, I think he said, at some time in the evening, to turn all the servants working in the hotels out into the streets. It would be perfectly easy so to frame his Bill that it would not apply to barmaids and women serving in that capacity; and probably it was not intended to apply altogether to house work. But it seems to me that it would be perfectly easy so to frame it as to do away altogether with that objection. All these objections to some of the details could be easily remedied in going through Committee. The Home Secretary, the hon. Member who has just sat down, and the hon. Member for Poplar all used arguments founded on the statement that this Bill will reduce wages. Well, I cannot for the life of me see how the Bill will reduce wages; the amount of goods that purchasers are going to purchase in certain shops is still going to be purchased. The early closing movement to reduce the hours of labour has been organised by Associations without the authority of the people to whom these restrictions would apply. The result has been that some small shops have been infringing the restrictions just because there was no Parliamentary sanction given to those restrictions. The authority was not strong enough to enforce it. But if we pass legislation on the subject, it seems to me these objections will be done away with; and all these small shops will be obliged to comply with the restrictions, and customers

will buy all the goods they were going to buy just the same. The only result will be that they will do it in a shorter time. The customers of all these shops will continue the same, the trade will continue as good, and therefore I see no reason whatever why, on that ground, wages should be reduced. It seems to me that the answer to the suggestion that this Bill, if passed, would throw a large number of women out of work is to be found in the fact that the greater part of this employment could only be performed by women. And with regard to large establishments, such as the Army and Navy Stores, and Marshall and Snelgrove's, it appears to me that this Bill will not apply to these establishments at all. It will chiefly apply to the small shops in the small towns. I should not have intervened in this Debate at all except that my name happened to be on the back of the Bill, and that I am an ardent supporter of it, and I desired to answer one or two points which the hon. Member for Camberwell had started. I hope the House will pass the Second Reading of the Bill; and if we have a bad case, that can be ascertained before a Select Committee.

\*(5.0.) MR. HENRY JOHN ROBY (Lancashire, S.E., Eccles): I desire to say a few words in support of this Bill, partly on account of what has fallen from the hon. Member for Crewe, and partly because I am myself an employer of young women in a cotton factory. This Bill only proposes to lay down a certain number of hours in the week; and that would allow a considerable modification for the particular days in the week. I see no difficulty whatever in the proposal that, in order to make up for the extension of hours on some days, there should be some diminution on other days of the week. I cannot myself see that to restrict women in shops to 74 hours per week can possibly lead to throwing a large number of women out of employment. I do not think there is any ground for that. At the same time, it is no doubt a perfectly reasonable thing that we

should be well on our guard against it. In this matter of the limitation of the hours of employment, I am not inclined to go simply on one general rule, or on logical grounds to apply the restriction where it would lead to inconvenience. In my opinion, it is a difficult subject, and a subject that ought to have progressive treatment. I am prepared to see Parliament interfere with more than one industrial trade, but I wish it done only gradually—I wish to see it done by taking certain employments at a time, and seeing how far it can be carried out with regard to these employments; and it ought not to be carried out at all unless the great majority of those employed are in favour of it. Then comes the question whether we should have a Select Committee first, and then propose a Bill; or whether we should take the Second Reading of this Bill, and then have a Select Committee. My own belief is that we should be more likely to get the evidence of the willingness or unwillingness of those concerned in those restrictions if we passed the Second Reading of the Bill, and had the Select Committee afterwards. That would be better than if we refused the Second Reading, thereby implying to the country that this matter is not worth consideration. On that account I shall vote heartily for the Second Reading, reserving to myself the power to act afterwards in accordance with the evidence produced, and after consideration of such Amendments as may be proposed.

\*(5.6.) **SIR CHARLES DALRYMPLE** (Ipswich): I rise to make a suggestion exactly opposite to that which has been made by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I understood that the Secretary of State, while he did not approve of the Bill, favoured an inquiry by a Select Committee. I would suggest to the promoters of the Bill whether the wiser course for them to adopt would not be to withdraw the Bill (cries of "No") on condition that they receive from Her Majesty's Government an undertaking to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the subject. I make this suggestion, being favourable to the

*Mr. Henry John Roby*

proposal for a Select Committee. I think it very possible, if hon. Gentlemen insist on going to a Division, that the Bill might be defeated, in which case they will lose everything.

(5.7.) **MR. CHARLES FENWICK** (Northumberland, Wansbeck): I rise simply for the purpose of replying to a statement made by the hon. Member for Crewe, which I shall do in a sentence. His statement was to the effect that there was no demand made by those interested in this question for such a limitation of their hours as is proposed in the Bill of my hon. Friend below me. Perhaps the hon. Member for Crewe will allow that I have an opportunity of knowing, probably better than he has, that the opposite of his statement is the fact, and that there is a considerable demand on the part of those that would be affected by the provisions of this Bill, that some such diminution should be made in the hours of labour which they are now compelled to work; and only at the recent Trades Union Congress, held at Newcastle-on-Tyne, a resolution was submitted by the representative of the shop-assistants to this effect. It is perfectly true that that resolution was not submitted to the judgment of the Congress; but I think that, judging from the expressions of opinion which I had an opportunity of listening to at the Congress, there is not the slightest doubt that if the resolution had been submitted to the judgment of the Congress, it would have been passed by a very large majority indeed. The resolution was afterwards submitted to the judgment of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress—a Committee composed of gentlemen who take opposite views on the question as to the Parliamentary or legal limitation of hours of labour, and I am in a position to say that that resolution was endorsed unanimously by the members of the Parliamentary

Committee; and, therefore, it has the same sanction in the opinion of the organised trades of the country as if it had been endorsed by a large majority voting in the Congress itself; so that, therefore, the House will see that there has been an expression of opinion, at all events, from those interested in this subject. But my hon. Friend has gone further. He has said that as there is no demand on this subject, there can be no inquiry, and I think he has adopted a course which, if the House will follow him, would prevent the possibility of immediate inquiry on this subject, because we have no guarantee from the Government that if the Bill be withdrawn they will constitute that Committee which he says the House is anxious they should constitute. While I reserve to myself the right to take whatever course may seem wise and prudent to me with regard to the provisions of the Bill when it comes back again to the House from the Committee, without committing myself to the details of the Bill in any way, I believe it would be wise on the part of the House to allow the Second Reading of the Bill to be carried, and send the Bill to a Select Committee, so that we may have the proposals contained in the Bill fully and freely considered. Hence I shall have no hesitation in supporting the Second Reading of the Bill.

(5.10.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Though I think it is not a question upon which the Government, as such, propose to offer advice to the House, I may perhaps be permitted to give my own view as to what would be expedient for the promoters of the Bill to do on the present occasion, and I think it is the view of hon. Members generally on both sides of the House. It appears to be the general opinion that there are sufficient precedents in our legislation for interfering with the labour of adult women to prevent it being a matter of principle to reject the Bill. I also think it is the general opinion that in some

cases there may be a certain amount of undue length of employment during the week of women in shops and other places in large towns. But I do not think anybody could have listened to the Debate without also coming to the conclusion that the Bill before us is impracticable; that it cannot be carried out; that if we attempted to carry it out at all in the form in which the hon. Gentleman has introduced it, it would prove to be a wholly unworkable measure; and that if it is possible to apply the hon. Gentleman's principle at all, it is not possible to apply it without the most careful preliminary consideration of all the difficulties surrounding a most difficult subject. Now, I must observe to the hon. Gentleman, that that being the view of a very large number of Gentlemen in the House, including my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary and others, he will, in a Division upon this Bill, have against him many persons not averse to legislation of this kind, if the necessity for such legislation can be shown, but altogether averse to committing the House of Commons to a scheme which they believe to be radically impracticable. Hon. Gentlemen opposite must be aware that if this Bill were carried against that large amount of opinion to which I have adverted, all that could then happen to it would be to refer it to a Select Committee, either to be rejected or knocked into some sort of shape very different from that which it now presents to the House, and its friends would be weakened by the opinion expressed by a very large section of the House of Commons that this Bill before us was not one that should be passed into law. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down said he would vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, because he approved of its principle.

MR. FENWICK: Might I interrupt the right hon. Gentleman? I did not say that I approved of the principle. I approve of inquiry, and reserve to myself liberty of action when the Report of that inquiry was submitted to the House. It is because the issue, as I

understand it, clearly before the House at present is whether there shall or shall not be an inquiry into the subject that I propose to vote for the Second Reading.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then I understand the hon. Gentleman does not even approve of the principle of the Bill?

MR. FENWICK; I did not say so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He does not commit himself to an approval of the principle of the Bill, but what he desires is an inquiry. What we are prepared to give is an inquiry; but what we are unwilling to give, and what I think many hon. Members in this House are unwilling to give, is the apparent adhesion of the House to a proposal which they do not think a workable proposal. I would therefore seriously suggest to the hon. Member and his friends that his object may be better carried out, or that he would get his end effected, with much less friction and with far more unanimity, if he would consent to withdraw the Bill, which even those who are going to vote for it do not commit themselves to approval of; and if he would consent to accept the offer made by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary at an early stage of this Debate, that this question should be referred to a Select Committee for critical examination.

\*MR. A. D. PROVAND: I thank the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord for what he has said on this subject, and the Government for the statement that this is not to be a Party question. Nevertheless, I think we had better go to a Division. I stated, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, that, for my own part, I was prepared to accept the Amendment placed upon the Paper by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for London University, and I am still prepared to do so. The Bill, when it goes before a Select Committee, will there be inquired into in any way they

*Mr. Fenwick*

please. If they condemn it, why then we shall hear no more of it in this House; but if they approve of it in any form, it will then come back. Therefore I cannot accept the compromise which the First Lord has offered, and I think it better to take our chance in a Division.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 175; Noes 152.—(Div. List, No. 6.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee.

#### MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.—(No. 47.)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): On behalf of my hon. Friend I beg to move that the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill be read and discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Order read and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

#### COMPULSORY SALE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 51.)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): As this Bill embodies the unanimous desire of the Irish tenant farmers, I hope hon. Members will not object to give it a Second Reading.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I object.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

#### SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT (1879) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 133.)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. W. H. CROSS (Liverpool, West Derby): I hope the House will allow this Bill to be read a second time. It simply gives a right of appeal from the decision of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to the country districts, the same as now obtains in the Metropolitan Police District.

F. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): entitled to know what this Bill auses, if it is good for England, I want it extended to Ireland.

on made, and Question proposed, the Bill be now read a second—(*Mr. W. H. Cross.*)

KNOX (Cavan, W.) I object. and Reading deferred till Wednesday.

3 (WEEKLY HALF-HOLIDAY) BILL.—(No. 142.)

SECOND READING.

for Second Reading read.

JOHN LUBBOCK (London City): I beg to move the Second of this Bill, which enables authorities, if two-thirds of the desire, to establish a weekly iday.

on made, and Question proposed, the Bill be now read a second—(*Sir John Lubbock.*)

KELLY (Camberwell, N.): I and Reading deferred till Monday

HOUSES (HOURS OF CLOSING) (NOTLAND) BILL.—(No. 92.)

READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

read, for resuming Adjourned [12th February].

AMERON (Glasgow, College): Sir, now that the Lord Advocate that this Bill is the same as ich was before the House last d, as it has the support of all tch Members, he will allow it ad a second time.

tion taken.

ned Debate further adjourned orrow.

PAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 34.)

EE. [*Progress 18th February.*]

nsidered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

W. LOWTHER in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): This Bill was read a second time a week ago, and I should like to ask when the Government will put down their Amendments to it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There is no unfairness in the course which the Government have taken. We do not think, so far as we are concerned, a Subsidiary Bill should be run by hon. Members and discussed by the House before the Bill of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I fail to see any cogency in the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, or any agreement or connection between the Local Government Bill and this Bill. The House by an unanimous vote, and with the concurrence of the Government, passed the Second Reading of this measure. We have yet to see whether the Government Bill will command support. This Bill stands in a better position. It is the Bill of the whole House, and what we ask is whether the Government intend to allow this Bill to be blocked by their own supporters.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): It is quite impossible for me to put down my Amendments until I see the print of the Local Government Bill. I am, therefore, obliged to ask hon. Members to defer the Bill for a few days longer.

MR. T. M. HEALY: We are quite willing to do that. What we complain of is the conduct of the Government.

Objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Friday.

*MOTIONS.*

INDIAN COUNCILS ACT (1861) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Sir William Plowden, Bill to amend "The Indian Councils Act, 1861," ordered to be brought in by Sir William Plowden, Mr. Beaufoy, and Mr. Lawson. •  
Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 193.]

FEU DUTIES RATING BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to provide for the taxation for local purposes of Feu Duties and Ground Annuals in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Esslemont, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Leng, Mr. Alexander Laing Brown, and Mr. John Wilson (Lanark).  
Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 194.]

NATIONAL DEBT (MILITARY SAVINGS BANKS).

Account presented,—of the Gross Amount of all Moneys received and paid by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, on account of the Fund for Military Savings Banks, from 19th September 1845 to 5th January 1892 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1892-3.

Copy presented,—of Navy Estimates for the year 1892-3, with Explanatory Observations by the Financial Secretary and Explanation of Differences [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 81.]

GREAT NORTHERN (IRELAND) RAILWAY.

Copy ordered—

"Of the Report of Inquiry by the Board of Trade, and of the Correspondence relative to the Condition of the Line and Rolling Stock, the Insufficiency of the Accommodation, and the Inadequacy of the Train Service from Dundalk to Bundoran and Londonderry via Enniskillen on the Great Northern (Ireland) Railway."—(*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*.)

CORN PRICES, 1891.

Copy ordered,—

"Of Statistical Tables of Corn Prices for the year 1891, with Comparative Tables for previous years, and Memorandum."—(*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*.)

ADJOURNMENT.

(5.43.) On the Motion for Adjournment:—

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I think we are entitled to complain of the extraordinary delay that has taken place in the circulation of the Irish Local Government Bill. Several days have passed since the Bill was read a first time, and we were led to expect it would be in our hands before this. There are rumours that the Bill will appear in a shape different from that in which it was presented to the House, and on that point perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, whom I see in his place, will give us some information. In regard to the Corporation of Belfast, there is standing for consideration on Friday next a Bill which proposes to give special powers in relation to a matter which is to be dealt with as a matter of general law by the Local Government Bill, and, therefore, it is absolutely necessary that the latter Bill should be circulated among Members to-morrow.

(5.45.) THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I would strongly advise the hon. Member not to believe in the rumours to which he has alluded. As to the date when the Local Government Bill was to be circulated, if I remember rightly, the Leader of the House said he hoped it would be ready on Thursday.

MR. SEXTON: No; early in the week.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: The last time my right hon. Friend gave an answer on the subject, I think Thursday was the date named; however, I will convey to my right hon. Friend what the hon. Member has said, and I am sure he will be glad to have the Bill circulated as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.





11

12

13

14

15

16

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

1, 25th February, 1892.

## NEW PEER.

n. Thomson, knight, having  
Baron Kelvin of Largs in  
of Ayr—Was (in the usual  
roduced.

NUISANCE ABATEMENT  
(TROPOLIS) BILL.

MATHEDEN AND CAMP-  
Lords, I give notice that  
the 4th of March, I shall  
cond Reading of the Bill  
tement of Smoke in the

## TRUSTS BILL [H.L.]

clare and amend certain pro-  
a law relating to trusts—Was  
the Lord Chancellor; read 1<sup>st</sup>;  
ad. (No. 20.)

THE OFFICERS BILL [H.L.  
(No. 18.)

## COMMITTEE.

Committee (on Re-commit-  
ding to Order).

## BILL OF NORTHBROOK:

I beg to move that the  
e Governor General of  
nitted from the Schedule  
I have not made any  
on the clauses of the  
gh I cannot say that I  
gree with those clauses, be-  
ought that it would save  
ips' time and trouble if I  
to the two points which  
ress upon your Lordships,  
it is not desirable to allow  
y of State to call the  
neral of India back upon  
England, or that the  
neral should absent him-  
lia for six months upon a  
ificate; and the same thing  
t to the Commander-in-  
Lords, when the Bill was  
d tim; I gave to those of  
ips w<sup>o</sup> were then present  
which I had for wishing

those alterations to be made in the  
Bill. They are very simple. I believe  
that all your Lordships will agree that  
India is a country where great and  
sudden dangers not unfrequently occur;  
and I suppose your Lordships would  
also agree that it might be very serious  
indeed if, when such a sudden danger  
occurred, the Governor General of  
India should be absent from India,  
and his place should be filled  
temporarily by some one who, how-  
ever able, could not possibly carry  
the same weight as one who had been  
the Head of the Administration. I  
believe that the provisions of the Bill  
would require, when the Governor  
General was called home by the Secre-  
tary of State, or went home on sick  
leave, that the senior of the Governors  
of the two other Presidencies should  
take his place; and it does not always  
occur that either of the distinguished men  
who fill those places could have the  
same acquaintance with the affairs of  
India, or carry the same weight in the  
country, as one who had been selected  
for the office of Governor General. My  
Lords, for that reason I think it is very  
unadvisable to give the powers conferred  
by this Bill. When the Secretary of  
State for India moved the Second Read-  
ing of the Bill he gave some indication  
that the Governor General might be  
omitted from the Bill, upon further  
consideration; and when the Prime  
Minister, in answering the few remarks  
which I made the other night, gave the  
reasons which he thought made the Bill  
desirable, he rested his argument upon  
quite a different matter; he rested his  
argument upon the possibility that it  
might be very desirable that one of the  
Members of the Governor General's  
Council could be summoned home to  
England to confer with the Home  
Authorities. My Lords, I think that  
the observation made by the noble  
Marquess was very pertinent. I do  
not at all dispute that in certain cir-  
cumstances it might be desirable to  
summon home on business one of the  
Members of the Governor General's  
Council in order to confer with the  
Secretary of State; and, therefore, I do  
not propose to move the omission of  
the power to call home on business  
from India the Members of the  
Governor General's Council. But the

noble Marquess did not give any reasons, if my recollection serves me rightly, for the necessity of summoning home the Governor General of India. The Secretary of State did not give, either this Session or last Session, when the Bill was introduced, any reason, upon public grounds, why he thought it was desirable to summon the Governor General from India to this country; and the other day I asked him whether he could produce any correspondence which would show that this proposal (which is one of considerable importance, as I think all your Lordships will admit) had been communicated to the Government of India, and that the Government of India had had any opportunity of expressing an opinion upon changes which may very seriously affect the administration of affairs in that country. My Lords, in my opinion—I speak, perhaps, somewhat from the Indian point of view—but still, in my opinion, such legislation as this should not be introduced into this House, or in the other House of Parliament, excepting in very peculiar circumstances, unless the Government of India have had an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. There can be no reason at all in this case why the matter should not have been communicated to the Government of India, and an answer might well have been received between last Session and this. And, indeed, no urgency whatever has been alleged by the Secretary of State for introducing this Bill. Therefore, my Lords, I should very much prefer that the Secretary of State would drop this Bill altogether; but, as I do not suppose he will be prepared to take that course, I beg to move that the Governor General of India be omitted from the Schedule.

Amendment moved, in page 2, line 16, omit "The Governor General of India."  
—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (*The Viscount Cross*): My Lords, I think your Lordships will see at once that, since this Bill was read a second time, the provisions in the first clause have been made rather stronger than they were in the original Bill. The Bill was never intended to enable the Government to call home any

one of these persons except for special reasons; and, in order to show that it must be a very special reason, you have the safeguard of the approval of the Secretary of State in Council to begin with, and that of the Governor General in Council as well; and then you have the further safeguard, that these persons are only to be allowed to come home on public grounds, or upon a medical certificate, for a short time. But, my Lords, although the Government are of opinion that it is quite right that there should be some power that these persons may be allowed to come home in case of necessity; and although they are of opinion that the original provision in the old Act was perfectly right when the journey to and from India was so long; yet the fact of the journey being now so very much shortened materially alters the case as to the question of these great personages being allowed to come home. Because, not only would they come home in a very much shorter time, but, if anything should happen in India to require their immediate presence there, their return to India would, of course, be equally shortened. But, my Lords, I am, as Secretary of State, and I am quite sure all my colleagues are, always most anxious to listen to anything which falls from the noble Earl, considering the great position he has himself held in India, and the interest he has always taken in any matter relating to India since his return to your Lordships' House sitting here; and, therefore, I am quite willing to take into consideration what he has said. My Lords, when the Bill was before your Lordships' House the other day the noble Earl said what was perfectly true—that the Viceroy of India stood upon a sort of pinnacle that no one else could stand upon; that he was in a position totally different from that of any other officer in India. It is equally true that, if you want to consult on matters of very great importance with regard to general questions in India, it is possible to make use of one of the Members of the Governor General's Council, who would come home perfectly prepared to give you all the intelligence that the Viceroy could give. Therefore, my Lords, upon that particular point I am

*The Earl of Northbrook*

ious to meet the noble Earl so far I can; and, considering that the Army stands entirely alone and quite distinct from all the other officers mentioned in the Bill, Her Majesty's Government will assent to the Amendment of the noble Earl. I cannot give him any hope that we will assent to the other Amendment which stands in his name, because I think the Commander-in-Chief stands on a totally different footing; but, considering the immense importance of the Viceroy of India, and how he does stand out as a pinnacle above everybody else, we will agree to the Amendment of the noble Earl in this matter. I may say, my Lords, that the second clause will be amended in consequence, but it cannot be done by the Standing Committee; and so will the Schedule be amended in another way; but, so far as this particular Amendment of the noble Earl is concerned, I am willing to agree to it. In order to make the Schedule clear, it will be necessary to say "The members of the Council of the Governor General of India."

Amendment agreed to.

**THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK:** My Lords, I now beg to move that the words "The Commander-in-Chief of Forces in India," be omitted from the Schedule. The observations which have been made upon the subject of the Governor General seem to me to apply, with almost equal force, to the office of Commander-in-Chief of the Forces. My Lords, India is a country in which, as I said before, dangers occur suddenly, and military dangers occur with the greatest suddenness. I suppose many of your Lordships are old enough to recollect the time of the Mutiny. How long before the Mutiny took place was it thought possible that such a thing would occur? And, my Lords, even if we have had, within the last two or three years, constant outbreaks of hostilities of one kind or the other in India. So lately as last year we had a very sad event in Manipur, and it was not more than a week ago that we read from the papers that some hostilities had occurred in Burmah. Now, my Lords, I, myself, think that the Commander-in-Chief is an officer whose responsibility is so

great in that country that he ought to take his five years' appointment for good or for bad, and not to return from India to this country during those five years. In case of the Commander-in-Chief being attacked with illness, if the illness was not very severe indeed, India possesses climates of every description; there is no difficulty in his obtaining change of climate in India at all; and I cannot conceive that, in the case of an illness so grave as to require his absence in England for six months, it would not be, in the public interest, desirable that the Commander-in-Chief should receive a successor to his appointment; and, being an officer of high military position, it does not seem to me that it would be likely in any way to interfere with his future career—other offices would be open to him which he could fill. That is with respect to his coming home on sick leave. It has not always been that the next senior officer (who, I suppose, is the person who would be appointed), would be an officer who would command the confidence of the Government here, or in India, to the same extent as would the Commander-in-Chief. In point of fact, if I were to ask the Secretary of State whether he could say that there is any officer now in India whom he would be inclined to appoint to be Commander-in-Chief in India, in the event of a vacancy, I doubt very much whether he would be able at this moment to name such an officer. That is a reason why I think that this officer also ought to retain his appointment, and not to leave India. Now, my Lords, as respects summoning home the Commander-in-Chief in India on business, I think there are considerable objections to it. If the Commander-in-Chief has to come home on business connected with the Army in England, by the provisions of the Bill the whole expense of his substitute and everything else would fall upon the revenues of India. Surely that is not fair! If the Secretary of State proposes to introduce clauses in the other House, putting that expense upon the Imperial revenues, well and good; but there is no such provision now in the Bill. My Lords, if the Commander-in-Chief is to come home on Indian business connected

with Indian military affairs, I think it is not fair upon the Governor General in Council. There is no military business, in my opinion, in India—no military question in India—which is not essentially affected by political considerations; and the effect of the Commander-in-Chief being summoned home on Indian military business to confer with the Government in this country (apart from the Governor General and the members of his Council) would be that the Governor General and the members of his Council would not be able, if they disagreed with the Commander-in-Chief, to represent to the Home Authorities the political views which they might hold, and which, if they could represent them, might very much modify the opinion of the Government upon important questions. I hold, therefore, that the Commander-in-Chief coming home to be consulted upon an Indian military question, apart from the Governor General, when the Governor General could not be represented, would not be fair or right to the Government in India. On those grounds therefore, my Lords, I beg to move that the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in India be omitted from the schedule.

Amendment moved, in page 2, line 18, omit "The Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in India."—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

\*THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I should be loth to sacrifice the discretion which we desire to obtain for the Secretary of State and the Viceroy in respect to this matter of the Commander-in-Chief coming home. The noble Lord seems to deal with the matter chiefly as an individual question as to what was fair to the Commander-in-Chief, and what was fair to the Viceroy. Those are important considerations; but there are public considerations of very much greater value. I do not base this provision chiefly, though I should to some extent, upon the question of a medical certificate. There is something to be said for the view of the noble Lord that, if the Commander-in-Chief is not well enough to continue in his work, he may be required to re-

*The Earl of Northbrook*

sign—though I think it is rather an inconvenient doctrine, and at variance with what is accepted in all other parts of the Indian Service at the present time. But I would venture to remind the noble Lord that the existing law in no way protects India from being left without her Commander-in-Chief. He may, at this moment, go to the Cape, and, for all I know, he may go up to Mashonaland; that is within Indian limits; and there is nothing to prevent his doing so. Therefore the protection is illusory, and I hardly think it is worth while to maintain it in this matter of medical certificate. But I acknowledge that it is not the question of medical certificate that is uppermost in my own mind. The noble Lord, at an earlier part of this conversation, freely admitted that consultation with the members of the Governor General's Council might be a matter of considerable value to the Government in England. But the Commander-in-Chief is one of the most important members of the Governor General's Council; and the matters on which the English Government would wish to consult him are matters more deeply affecting the welfare and maintenance of the Empire than any other matters that could be conceived. The noble Lord speaks as though military questions were divided by a sharp line into two categories: those which concern the Army in England, and those which concern the Army in India. Does it not occur to him that there is a class of military questions which concern both Armies very closely—and those military questions in which not only the Army in India, but the whole strength of the Empire may be involved—with respect to which the main decisions have to be taken in India, though they must be taken in consonance with the views that are held at home? Those questions have become much more important since the noble Lord was practically familiar with Indian Government. Since the year 1876 those questions have grown into vast importance. I will venture to say that no one who is familiar with the military questions of the day could put out of view the class of occasions on which it might be necessary for the English Army and the Indian Army to co-

operate. My Lords, I can conceive of no question, or set of questions, upon which mature, and circumspect, and careful decision, taken in time before danger comes, by the English and by the Indian Government, is more vital to the interests of the Empire. I can conceive of no set of questions upon which all the light that can be thrown by the military knowledge and experience, both of those who rule in India and those who rule in England, is more required for guiding us into a right and wholesome path; and I will venture to say, speaking from my own personal experience,—for in these days these matters are not often absent from our consideration,—that, within no very great distance of time, it would have been a matter of the greatest possible satisfaction to myself, and to those with whom I act, if we could have had oral communication with the Commander-in-Chief in India. My Lords, I hope you will not ask me to develop that thesis. I think that most who hear me will see that it is capable of wide development, and that interests of a very considerable magnitude may hang upon the decision at which you arrive. I earnestly ask you not to take away this power, that we seek to obtain, from the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India. There is no probability that they will use it lightly, use it without cause, use it for any frivolous reason. And, with respect to the last observations made by the noble Lord as to who is to pay the steamer fare of the Commander-in-Chief when coming home, if these matters are really important in the highest interests of the Empire, do not let us quarrel about which Treasury is to bear the cost of the travelling expenses. I think we are capable of coming to some arrangement upon that point. My Lords, I should, of course, repel at once the idea that the Commander-in-Chief would be often sent for. I believe it must necessarily be an occasion of very great rarity; but I can imagine, as I have said, cases in which it would be a matter of enormous value to our highest interests that we should send for him; and I cannot conceive that any real danger would arise from it. You have always two

Commanders-in-Chief, chosen specially for their powers of governing large Armies in vast districts—the Commanders-in-Chief of Bombay and Madras; and either of those could surely hold, for the few necessary weeks, the office of acting Commander-in-Chief, while the actual tenant of the post was in England on consultation. If anything happened to him; if he was disabled; if he was killed; such a remedy would have to be taken; and nobody has ever yet suggested that any great danger lurked in that contingency. My Lords, without for a moment pretending (I desire to guard myself on that point) that such power would often be used, I say that the discretion of using it ought to be with the Government, and I hope your Lordships will not refuse it.

\*THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, no doubt the mode in which the noble Marquess has approached this question is one which may make one hesitate upon this Amendment; because he has indicated that there are some tremendous occasions, to which he does not think it right, no doubt for public reasons, to allude, on which the presence of the Commander-in-Chief in this country is, in his opinion, of the very highest moment and importance. My Lords, not knowing what the circumstances are to which the noble Marquess refers, I cannot give my opinion upon them; but I have had myself some experience in the Office of Secretary of State for India, and certainly the military questions, which arose during the time I held that Office, were of so grave a nature that I can scarcely conceive that anything so grave can have arisen during the tenure of Office of the present Government. It never occurred to me, or to any of my Colleagues, that, in the circumstances in which we were then placed, it would for a moment have been desirable to have asked the Commander-in-Chief to come over to this country. I cannot allude further, any more than the noble Marquess could, to all the circumstances of the time; because, of course, one's opinion depends upon confidential information to which I had access, and to which it would be highly improper that I should allude in this House. But I still feel that,

although it would be impossible to deny the weight of the arguments used by the noble Marquess on the one side, there is very great weight indeed in what has been said by my noble Friend (Lord Northbrook) upon the other. The circumstances of India, as my noble Friend has pointed out, are wholly different from those to which we are accustomed in this country. Everyone knows that a small cloud in the distance will suddenly spread into a hurricane, and, before your Commander-in-Chief could get back from this country to India, his absence from the Indian Empire might be the cause of very serious disasters. My Lords, if I felt perfectly satisfied that it was only upon some extraordinary occasion that such a power as this would be used, I might regard it with more indifference; but your Lordships must remember what the working of clauses of this kind is. It is all very well to say that the consent of the Governor General in Council is required; but I do not believe that, if the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief in India both desired that this power should be used, it would be possible for the Viceroy in Council to resist the demand; and what I should be afraid of is that this power would come to be used upon occasions not so grave as those which the noble Marquess has in his mind. Of course it is a balance of advantages and disadvantages. As I said the other night, I do not for a moment undervalue in the slightest degree—it would be childish to do so—the advantages of consultation with high officers. The whole question turns upon this: is it, upon the whole, more likely that the Public Service will suffer seriously by the Government not being able to bring over the Commander-in-Chief, or that the Empire of India may be endangered by the possible absence of the Commander-in-Chief at a crisis when his presence is greatly required? That is a matter upon which each person must form his own opinion. I, myself, for my own part, would greatly prefer that the law should rest as it is. With regard to sick leave, I think the natural conclusion from the noble Marquess's argument would be that the power of the Commander-in-Chief to go to the Cape ought to be abro-

*The Earl of Kimberley*

gated. That, however, is a matter which I will not press further. Upon the whole, I must say that I remain of the same opinion as my noble Friend (Lord Northbrook).

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Schedule? Their Lordships divided: Contents 27; Not-Contents 20.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 21.)

#### BETTING AND LOANS (INFANTS) BILL [H. L.]—(No. 13.)

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3<sup>d</sup> on Monday next.

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL [H. L.]—(No. 4.)

Third Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Monday next.

#### LONDON FOG.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, since my noble Friend the Prime Minister expressed his willingness to support the appointment of a Committee to inquire into this question, I have carefully considered the matter, and have taken counsel with those upon whose opinion I could rely; and I have come to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that no good or useful purpose is likely to be served if the Committee is to be restricted simply to Members of your Lordships' House. I say this for three reasons. In the first place, a Committee of your Lordships' House has already sat to inquire into this question, or into the kindred matter of the prevention of smoke, in the year 1887. Several distinguished Members of your Lordships' House served upon it; a Bill, founded upon the recommendations of the Committee, was subsequently introduced into the House: has been annually introduced for five years: and is still in the stage of being set down for Second Reading. That is not encouraging as to the results of the outcome of a Committee of your Lordships' House. But, in the second place, since the year 1887,

not only do we know a good deal more about the subject-matter, but science has considerably advanced, and various methods for dealing with the subject have now been suggested, which were not known at the time when that Committee was appointed. But, in order that these methods should be properly tested and appreciated, they should be tested by those who are experts, and the number of those experts in a matter of this kind on the Benches of your Lordships' House is, and must always remain, limited. It is true that, within the last 24 hours, we have received a very distinguished addition to that number, in the person of the noble Lord who has taken his seat for the first time to-day. But that does not alter the fact that there are but very few of your Lordships' House, and those some of the busiest, and consequently most occupied, who could be appealed to to serve upon a Committee for this purpose. But there is a third, and a still more practical reason, which, after an experience (which has not been a short one now) of legislation, both in another place and in your Lordships' House, I think I am entitled to urge: and that is that, with hardly one single exception, no measure dealing with subjects of this kind, which has emanated from a Committee of your Lordships' House simply, and which has not been pressed in another place with all the force that the Government of the day have at its command, has had any chance whatsoever of passing into law. And in the case of a measure, founded upon the deliberations of a Committee of your Lordships' House in a matter of this kind, there would be a peculiar difficulty; because there are upon the Benches in another place many Members who are specially qualified by professional training to form their opinion upon a subject of this kind, and who are quite certain to tear in pieces any Bill that comes down from your Lordships' House, I am afraid in some cases because they have not been previously consulted in the matter. Now, my Lords, Her Majesty's Government have decided that it would not be desirable to issue a Royal Commission (which is the course I should have preferred) upon this subject, and, of course, I bow

to that decision; but I do venture to submit that a Joint Committee of both Houses might meet these particular difficulties to which I have already referred. In the first place, they would have before them all the printed evidence taken before the Committee of your Lordships' House. In the second place, it would be possible to re-inforce any Committee appointed by your Lordships' House by an equal number, at least, of men specially qualified to deal with the subject from the Benches in another place. And, thirdly, I think that the recommendations of such a Joint Committee would come with much greater force, and with a much greater chance of having practical legislation founded upon them, than any recommendations which were arrived at by a Committee composed simply of Members of your Lordships' House. Now, my Lords, I should not for a moment think of asking a Committee of that kind to embark upon what the noble Marquess seemed to be afraid I was touching upon—namely, a hopeless crusade against the vapours of the North Sea and the Essex Marshes. No, my Lords, the London fog is, I think, just one of those things of which it may be said, as is said with regard to vice, that it loses more than half its evils when it loses all its grossness; and, if you could take away from the London fog the elements introduced into it by Londoners themselves, you would have done much to render it less injurious to human life, certainly more innocuous as regards sapping the vital energy, and incomparably less expensive than London fogs at present are. It may be in the recollection of your Lordships that a single foggy day means an extra expenditure of £4,000 in gas alone; and that, by the best computation, every year the combustic products which are sent up the chimneys to poison the air, instead of being used to warm our rooms and dwellings, amount to a tax upon the community of somewhat upwards of £1,000,000 per annum. Those are established facts, and those facts can be proved. My Lords, it has also been suggested that my object was to point out particular remedies. My Lords, that is exactly the point I wish to avoid. I think it is most essential



that a burden of that kind should be left for the decision of a Committee, and that further inquiry should precede any legislation. As regards anthracite coal, I merely mentioned that as one of many methods which might be adopted for dealing with the question; and I think scant justice was done to it in the answer of the noble Marquess. If any of your Lordships wish to ascertain what may be done in that respect, I am given to understand that there is a fire burning at the present moment in the Prince's Chamber, which was lighted this morning, entirely composed of anthracite coal, which I have just been looking at myself. I found that there was a very wholesome flame proceeding from it; and certainly much more heat was given out than from the fireplace at the other end of the room. That, however, is only one branch of the subject. My Lords, since I first brought this subject before your Lordships' House, I have been inundated with suggestions, practical and unpractical, of all sorts and kinds. I have seen articles in almost every paper in the daily Press on the subject—many of them, I confess, not very encouraging to anyone who wishes to act as a reformer in this matter; but some pointing out that science has defined various remedies, any one or more of which might be adopted. And there is one remedy, at all events, within our reach. If we only agreed, by legislation, to say that all future grates should be so constructed as to consume their own smoke, and that all future ovens should be rendered smokeless, you would, at once, have done a great deal to cope with the increase of the evil which is daily going on. Had such a measure been adopted, which the Smoke Prevention Act suggested, and put into force 30 years ago, the air of London would now be comparatively pure. The great mischief has been done, not so much by the ordinary chimney as by the kitchen chimney, which must be in every house; and a very slight alteration indeed in many cases would entirely prevent the smoke and the deleterious action issuing therefrom. I merely mention these facts to prove that there is a distinct case to inquire into; and

*Viscount Middleton*

I believe that such an inquiry, if there is not to be a Royal Commission, might effectually and efficiently be carried on by a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament. Those are the views I venture to submit to your Lordships. I gave the Home Office private notice of the question I was about to put three or four days ago; and I hope no objection will be placed in the way if it be possible to form a Joint Committee of both Houses to inquire into this important matter. I do not say that such a Committee would be entirely, or perhaps even partly, successful; but I do say that the subject is one which touches the comfort and health of so large a portion of the community that we ought not to sit down with hands folded, and say that nothing can be done, until it has been proved, beyond all manner of doubt, that the evil is one which is irremediable, and with which it is impossible for us to deal.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, in the first place, I must be allowed to congratulate my noble Friend upon the valuable auxiliary that he obtained this morning to the arguments which he desires to press upon the House and upon the public. Not all the eloquence of my noble Friend was equal to that very dirty fog which we found upon coming into London this morning, and which made me feel a wish that it were possible by any means, Royal Commission or other, to further my noble Friend's desires. But I am afraid the facts are too strong for us. I am not going through the arguments that my noble Friend repeated, with great force, upon the evils or the remediability of the London fog. I am afraid lest I should be considered to be an advocate and friend of the fog—anything more near an *advocatus diaboli* I cannot imagine. But, on the present occasion, I have not to argue the larger question. My noble Friend has gone off the safe field of Committees of this House and Royal Commissions into an unknown country—into the question of Joint Committees. He is touching the mysterious parts of the Constitution. I do not exactly know what the principles are

in which Joint Committees are appointed, but I know that the suggestion of them is very apt to be ill received on the other side of the atrial Hall. I remember some years ago, when the noble Lords opposite were in power and had a large majority in the House of Commons, they proposed that the Indian Budget should be referred to a Joint Committee; that was a very reasonable proposal; but all the authority of Mr. Gladstone's Government of that day could not induce the House of Commons to accept it. And I am told that it is exceedingly unlikely that the House of Commons would accept a Joint Committee on this subject. hitherto Joint Committees, with I think only one exception, have been confined to questions concerning the Private Business of the two Houses. I will not undertake, on behalf of the House of Commons, that they would assent to a Joint Committee; I should be giving an undertaking which I should be wholly incapable of fulfilling; but I will undertake this: that if anyone moves in the House of Commons for a Joint Committee, and that House accepts it, I will do my best to persuade your Lordships' House to join with the House of Commons in entering upon it. I cannot do more than that. My Lords, much of my noble friend's remarks were addressed to the point that the House of Commons would not accept any measure that did not initiate with them. If that is the case, the proper course is clearly for my noble Friend to induce one of his many adherents in the other House to move for a Committee in that House, and I daresay he would move it with success. But I do not quite understand the modesty which induces my noble Friend to abstain from going forward in that path of investigation which has here selected. After all, the point is to collect information, and that information will be good enough whichever House it comes from; it will not matter which House has put it into the Blue Book; and, if my noble Friend can get together, by nomination in Committee, an amount of evidence which shows that there is an effective remedy for this evil, and that that remedy can be applied by

Parliament, I will venture to say that the House of Commons will attach just as much importance to that evidence as if it were gathered by themselves.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 25th February, 1892.*

### QUESTIONS.

#### JURORS AT IRISH ASSIZES.

MR. MULHOLLAND (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to resolutions unanimously passed by almost every Board of Guardians in Ulster, protesting against the existing system of summoning jurors to the Assizes without remuneration, or compensation for actual pecuniary loss incurred; and whether it is his intention to introduce a clause into the Local Government Bill for the purpose of removing this grievance?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): Resolutions such as are referred to in the question have been received from Boards of Guardians. There is no intention of introducing a clause in reference to the subject into the Local Government Bill.

MR. LEA (Londonderry, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I have given notice of a Motion for a Select Committee on the subject? Will the Government state now if they are willing to grant that Committee?

MR. JACKSON: I have not heard anything about a Committee. I am not aware that there are any differences between jurors in Ireland and in England. I am afraid that to serve as jurors is a sacrifice that has to be made by citizens in either country.

#### OPIUM CULTIVATION IN BENGAL.

SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India

whether he can state the number of acres licensed for poppy cultivation in Bengal in each year from 1880-81 to 1889-90, both inclusive; the number included in the revised Estimate for 1890-91, and in the Budget Estimate for 1891-2; the amount of Malwa revenue included in the revised Estimate of Rx.5,680,300 for 1890-91, and the amount of Malwa revenue included in the Budget Estimate for 1891-2 of Rx.5,318,000?

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire. Southport): For the ten years, the extent of poppy cultivation is in acres. 1880-81, 536,017; 1881-82, 531,275; 1882-83, 495,740; 1883-84, 505,843; 1884-85, 565,246; 1885-86, 594,921; 1886-87, 562,052; 1887-88, 536,607; 1888-89, 459,864; 1889-90, 482,557; in 1890-91 it was 500,688. The figures for 1891-92 have not yet been received, but in order to restrict the area of cultivation, the Government of India reduced the number of chests for sale in the year from 57,000 to 54,000. As to the revenue, the Malwa contribution was estimated at Rx.1,747,000 in both of the years named by the hon. Baronet.

#### THE STRANRAER MAILS

MR. MULHOLLAND (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to the statement publicly made by the Chairman of the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, on 12th February, that his Company were able and willing to carry the Mails between Stranraer and Londonderry in half an hour less time than they had undertaken by the recently concluded agreement; whether he can state how often the Mail Train for the North of Ireland has been more than ten minutes' late in arriving at Carlisle and at Stranraer since the establishment of the accelerated Mail service on 1st September, 1891; and whether he has taken any steps with the object of enforcing reasonable punctuality in the delivery of the mails at Stranraer by the English and Scotch Railway Companies concerned?

*Sir Joseph Pease*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester N.E.): Attention has been directed to the statement referred to, and the Department would be glad to have Mails carried between Stranraer and Derry in half-an-hour less time at present. But it is understood the Company make the proviso that the punctual arrival of the Mail Train at Stranraer shall be "ensured," and the Department is, of course, not in a position to guarantee absolute punctuality. Since the establishment of the Service on the 1st September last, the Mail Train has been more than ten minutes late at Carlisle on several occasions, and more than 10 minutes late at Stranraer on 101 occasions. In 50 of these cases the irregularity has exceeded 15 minutes, and in almost every instance in which there has been great delay, it has been due either to an accident or to the severity of the weather. Urgent representations have, however, been addressed to the Railway Companies concerning both as regards the general service and also in view of particular cases of delay, and they have promised to make every effort to secure punctuality. As I have already stated, the service is high, 40 miles an hour over all, for 100 miles, with about 70 miles of single line in Scotland. There is heavy work to be done at the stations, including growing Parcel Post; and, in the circumstances, absolute punctuality is difficult to maintain.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): The delay arises chiefly on the English or Irish side?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: The delay, as I have said, arises on the English and Scotch lines.

#### ARMY PENSIONS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether soldiers of over 50 years, who have served twelve years with colours, are entitled to have their names entered at Chelsea Hospital for a deferred pension under the War Pensions Act of 1847?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincoln. Horncastle): To be entitled to a deferred pension from the age of

years a soldier must have enlisted before 23rd July, 1864, and must have been discharged with two good conduct badges after not less than 14 years' service.

MAJOR RASCH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, will he have that fact more generally made known?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I will inquire, and see if it is necessary to advertise it further.

#### CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM IN INDIA.

MR. LEWIS FRY (Bristol, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a statement of the consumption of opium and its preparation in British India for the year 1890-1, similar to that for the previous ten years, contained in Statement B appended to the letter from the Government of India, dated 14th October last, recently made public; and whether the figures in Statement B refer to annual periods expiring on 31st March in each year; and, if so, whether he can explain why Statement B does not comprise the figures for the year ending 31st March, 1891?

\*MR. CURZON: No, Sir; the figures for 1890-1, in continuation of Statement B, have not yet been received from the Governor of India; but they will be laid on the Table as soon as they are received. In the meanwhile, I can give the hon. Member the figures as they appear in the Provincial Reports for all Provinces except Madras and the North West Provinces. The annual periods in Statement B expire on 31st March, except in the case of the North West Provinces, where they expire on 30th September. Statement B was sent home with the Governor of India's despatch of 14th October, 1891, when the figures for 1890-1 were not available in a complete form.

#### PRESBYTERIAN ARMY CHAPLAINS.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received the Report of a Committee of the Free Church of Scotland (since approved by the General Assembly) on the subject of Presbyterian Army Chaplains, in which it was suggested that the superintendence of

the work shall be carried on by a Committee representing all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, and ministers of all the Presbyterian Churches shall be eligible as chaplains; and whether, in view of the fact that the scheme proposed, besides providing much greater efficiency, will also secure economy, and that under the scheme the Presbyterian Churches undertake to supply all additional service needed beyond that provided by the fixed maximum expenditure of £800 per annum, he will give his favourable consideration to these proposals, with a view to their early adoption?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: Yes; I have received the Report in question; but I have no means of knowing whether the suggestions contained in it are acceptable to all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. Until I know this is the case, I am not in a position to consider the suggestions of the Report.

#### THE COASTGUARD O'HALLORAN AT EASTBOURNE.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will cause a strict inquiry to be made into the case of a coastguard man, recently stationed at Eastbourne, by name O'Halloran, who has just been pensioned out of the Service on two shillings per day, to which he was entitled by length of service, with a gratuity of only £3 as a compensation for 15 months of bodily suffering, due to a terrible accident on a dark night in November, 1890, when on patrol duty, and which has reduced him to the position of a helpless invalid for life; whether he is aware that, owing to the fence round the Redoubt at the east end of the town being of insufficient height, the coastguardman, who had only been about 48 hours at the station, stumbled over the fence and fell into the ditch, a distance of about 25 to 30 feet, and that he was after a time sent to Haslar and treated on the surgical side, and then on the medical side, and ultimately discharged as cured, whereas results show he ought not to have been discharged; whether he is aware that the man cannot be received into the Princess Alice Hospital at Eastbourne because of his

serious condition, and that, by the aid of private charity, he will be moved to the London Hospital, if possible; whether the fence round the Redoubt has since been greatly increased in height on the representation of the Vicar of the parish; and whether, under all the circumstances of the case, the Admiralty will consider the advisability of granting him some addition to his pension, in view of the fact that if the Redoubt had been private property heavy damages could have been recovered for injuries received?

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have had this case personally investigated by an officer of the Medical Department, and find that the circumstances attending the sad accident to O'Halloran are, in the main, as stated in the question. It does not, however, appear that any mismanagement occurred in the treatment of the injury; and, if desired, I shall be glad to show the Papers on the subject to the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The question of the pension to be awarded to O'Halloran has been again reviewed in the light of the circumstances which have now been fully reported; and the Admiralty consider that, under the regulations, they are justified in granting the unfortunate man an increased pension of £47 3s. a year for life, or 7d. a day more than the pension awarded in the first instance.

#### OUTRAGE NEAR CANTON.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to a report in the *Standard* of Thursday, 18th instant, of a violation of a Treaty by the Chinese Authorities of Canton, from which it appears that about a week ago the Canton officials, by order of the Viceroy, came with a band of soldiers and seized a warehouse occupied by a British merchant within the 30 mile Treaty radius of Canton, possessed themselves of all the business books and accounts, and now have carried off the whole of the merchandise contained in the warehouse, upon all of which full duty had been paid; and whether any steps have been taken

*Admiral Field*

by Her Majesty's Government to obtain satisfaction for the outrage, especially as the Chinese Authorities themselves regard it as a test case?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): A Report of this case has been received from the Acting British Consul at Canton. As his own representations to the Viceroy had been unavailing, he had referred the matter to Her Majesty's Minister at Peking, who had doubtless already addressed the Chinese Government upon the subject. Sir John Walsham will, however, be informed that the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the case, and that they await his Report of the result of the steps taken by him. It is only fair to add that the contention of the Chinese Authorities appears to be that the gentleman in question was not entitled, according to Treaty, to have a trading establishment at Fatsan, outside Canton, but the methods resorted to for the suppression of his business seem to have been unjustifiable. They further allege that he was guilty of smuggling, but this he entirely denies.

#### POSTAGE OF REQUISITION FORMS UNDER THE PARLIAMENTARY REGISTRATION (IRELAND) ACT.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, with reference to the forms of requisitions which, under "The Parliamentary Registration (Ireland) Act, 1885," clerks of unions are obliged to serve on inhabitant occupiers in Ireland, whether he is aware that in returning the same to the clerks the inhabitant occupiers are not obliged to prepay the postage, and that where the postage is not prepaid double postage has to be paid by the Board of Guardians; and whether, considering that this penalty is incurred through no fault of the Board, he will in such cases direct that the original halfpenny postage only be charged?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: I can only say that I have no power to remit the penalty in the cases described.

**THE CLAIMS OF PRISON WARDERS.**

**SIR JOSEPH PEASE** (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Committee of the same Office of last year, appointed to consider the claims of prison warders and other officers, in regard to certain matters concerning their remuneration and hours of duty, &c., has yet reported; and, if so, whether he will be prepared to lay the Report upon the Table of the House?

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. LATHUEWS, Birmingham, E.): The Committee on the claim of prison warders and other officers has reported, but, as I informed the hon. Baronet last session, it is not usual to publish the report of a Departmental Committee.

I can, however, state the decisions come to in consequence of the Report—namely, that the pay and emoluments of officers of local prisons have been increased; a larger amount of save has been sanctioned; and an addition has been made to the maximum rates of pay of assistant warders in convict prisons.

**RURAL POSTMEN.**

**MR. PHILIPPS** (Lanark, Mid): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether it is the case that unappointed rural postmen in Lanarkshire are only paid 18s. a week, with 12s. sick allowance, against 23s. pay, with full sick allowance, paid to the appointed rural postmen; whether the appointed postmen get pensions on retiring, while the unappointed postmen are not eligible for pensions; and whether the hours of labour and the work done by the two classes of men are frequently the same; and, if so, whether some attempt can be made to improve the condition of the unappointed postmen?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSSON**: If unestablished rural postmen doing a full day's work are referred to in this question they would be on fixed wages of, in some cases, as much as 18s. a week; they would also receive half-pay during sickness. Established postmen have a scale of wages rising to 22s. a week (not 23s.), and receive two-thirds pay during sickness. Un-

established men would not be eligible for pensions on retiring, as these are only granted to established postmen. Unestablished postmen are either men temporarily employed who may be permanently appointed when vacancies occur, or are men who are disqualified in some way for established appointments, but who are found able to do a particular duty, and whose employment is continued, therefore, as a favour, in order that they may not be sent adrift.

**EDINBURGH SCIENCE AND ART MUSEUM CLERKS.**

**MR. WALLACE** (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he can explain why only Clauses 8, 9, and 10 of the Order in Council of 21st March, 1890, have as yet been applied to the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art; and whether there is a probability of the remaining clauses being applied soon?

**THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL** (Sir W. HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): The Order in Council of 21st March, 1890, applies exclusively to clerks of the Second Division, of whom there are none at the Edinburgh Museum. The regulations respecting holidays, sick leave, and attendance-book, were settled Departmentally and without reference to the Order in Council of 21st March, 1890.

**WOODFORD AND WHITEGATE POSTAL SERVICE.**

**MR. M'DERMOTT** (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, with reference to the postal service at present existing between Woodford and Whitegate, whether he is aware that, owing to the delay at present involved in sending through Limerick and Dublin letters posted in either Whitegate and Woodford and addressed to the other town, a distance of only six miles, no letters requiring expedition can be sent through the post; and whether, considering the convenience of the people of the district, the increased number of letters which would be posted, and the fact that a rural messenger already goes about half the distance between these two towns, he will now have direct service established between them?

although it would be impossible to deny the weight of the arguments used by the noble Marquess on the one side, there is very great weight indeed in what has been said by my noble Friend (Lord Northbrook) upon the other. The circumstances of India, as my noble Friend has pointed out, are wholly different from those to which we are accustomed in this country. Everyone knows that a small cloud in the distance will suddenly spread into a hurricane, and, before your Commander-in-Chief could get back from this country to India, his absence from the Indian Empire might be the cause of very serious disasters. My Lords, if I felt perfectly satisfied that it was only upon some extraordinary occasion that such a power as this would be used, I might regard it with more indifference; but your Lordships must remember what the working of clauses of this kind is. It is all very well to say that the consent of the Governor-General in Council is required; but I do not believe that, if the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief in India both desired that this power should be used, it would be possible for the Viceroy in Council to resist the demand; and what I should be afraid of is that this power would come to be used upon occasions not so grave as those which the noble Marquess has in his mind. Of course it is a balance of advantages and disadvantages. As I said the other night, I do not for a moment undervalue in the slightest degree—it would be childish to do so—the advantages of consultation with high officers. The whole question turns upon this: is it, upon the whole, more likely that the Public Service will suffer seriously by the Government not being able to bring over the Commander-in-Chief, or that the Empire of India may be endangered by the possible absence of the Commander-in-Chief at a crisis when his presence is greatly required? That is a matter upon which each person must form his own opinion. I, myself, for my own part, would greatly prefer that the law should rest as it is. With regard to sick leave, I think the natural conclusion from the noble Marquess's argument would be that the power of the Commander-in-Chief to go to the Cape ought to be abro-

*The Earl of Kimberley*

gated. That, however, is a which I will not press further. the whole, I must say that I of the same opinion as my noble (Lord Northbrook).

On Question, whether the wor- posed to be left out shall stand the Schedule? Their Lordships di- Contents 27; Not-Contents 20.

Bill re-committed to the St Committee; and to be print- amended. (No. 21.)

#### BETTING AND LOANS (INFANTS [H. L.]—(No. 13.)

House in Committee (accord- order); Bill reported without A- ment; Standing Committee neg- and Bill to be read 3<sup>rd</sup> on Monday

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES [H. L.]—(No. 4.)

Third Reading (which stand- pointed for this day) put off to N- next.

#### LONDON FOG.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My since my noble Friend the Minister expressed his willingness to support the appointment of a mittee to inquire into this ques- have carefully considered the r- and have taken counsel with those whose opinion I could rely; and come to the conclusion, right- wrongly, that no good or usefu- pose is likely to be served if the mittee is to be restricted sim- Members of your Lordships' : I say this for three reasons. : first place, a Committee of your ships' House has already sat to i- into this question, or into the k- matter of the prevention of : in the year 1887. Several- guished Members of your Lon- House served upon it; a Bill, fr- upon the recommendations of- Committee, was subsequently- duced into the House: has- annually introduced for five- and is still in the stag- being set down for Second R- That is not encouraging as to- sults of the outcome of a Com- of your Lordships' House. If- the second place, since the yea-

It only do we know a good deal more about the subject-matter, but science is considerably advanced, and various methods for dealing with the subject have now been suggested, which were not known at the time when that Committee was appointed. But, in order that these methods should be properly tested and appreciated, they should be tested by those who are experts, and the number of those experts in a matter of this kind on the Benches of your Lordships' House is, and must always remain, limited. It is true that, within the last 24 hours, we have received a very distinguished addition to that number, in the person of the noble Lord who has taken his seat for the first time to-day. But that does not alter the fact that there are but very few of your Lordships' House, and those some of the busiest, and consequently most occupied, who could be appealed to to serve upon a Committee for this purpose. But there is a third, and a still more practical reason, which, after an experience (which has not been a short one now) of legislation, both in another place and in your Lordships' House, I think I am entitled to urge: and that is that, with hardly one single exception, no measure dealing with subjects of this kind, which has emanated from a Committee of your Lordships' House simply, and which has not been pressed in another place with all the force that the Government of the day have at its command, has had any chance whatsoever of passing into law. And in the case of a measure, founded upon the deliberations of a Committee of your Lordships' House in a matter of this kind, there would be a peculiar difficulty; because there are upon the Benches in another place many Members who are specially qualified by professional training to form their opinion upon a subject of this kind, and who are quite certain to tear in pieces any Bill that comes down from your Lordships' House, I am afraid in some cases because they have not been previously consulted in the matter. Now, my Lords, Her Majesty's Government have decided that it would not be desirable to issue a Royal Commission (which is the course I should have preferred) upon this subject, and, of course, I bow

to that decision; but I do venture to submit that a Joint Committee of both Houses might meet these particular difficulties to which I have already referred. In the first place, they would have before them all the printed evidence taken before the Committee of your Lordships' House. In the second place, it would be possible to re-inforce any Committee appointed by your Lordships' House by an equal number, at least, of men specially qualified to deal with the subject from the Benches in another place. And, thirdly, I think that the recommendations of such a Joint Committee would come with much greater force, and with a much greater chance of having practical legislation founded upon them, than any recommendations which were arrived at by a Committee composed simply of Members of your Lordships' House. Now, my Lords, I should not for a moment think of asking a Committee of that kind to embark upon what the noble Marquess seemed to be afraid I was touching upon—namely, a hopeless crusade against the vapours of the North Sea and the Essex Marshes. No, my Lords, the London fog is, I think, just one of those things of which it may be said, as is said with regard to vice, that it loses more than half its evils when it loses all its grossness; and, if you could take away from the London fog the elements introduced into it by Londoners themselves, you would have done much to render it less injurious to human life, certainly more innocuous as regards sapping the vital energy, and incomparably less expensive than London fogs at present are. It may be in the recollection of your Lordships that a single foggy day means an extra expenditure of £4,000 in gas alone; and that, by the best computation, every year the combustive products which are sent up the chimneys to poison the air, instead of being used to warm our rooms and dwellings, amount to a tax upon the community of somewhat upwards of £1,000,000 per annum. Those are established facts, and those facts can be proved. My Lords, it has also been suggested that my object was to point out particular remedies. My Lords, that is exactly the point I wish to avoid. I think it is most essential



that a burden of that kind should be left for the decision of a Committee, and that further inquiry should precede any legislation. As regards anthracite coal, I merely mentioned that as one of many methods which might be adopted for dealing with the question; and I think scant justice was done to it in the answer of the noble Marquess. If any of your Lordships wish to ascertain what may be done in that respect, I am given to understand that there is a fire burning at the present moment in the Prince's Chamber, which was lighted this morning, entirely composed of anthracite coal, which I have just been looking at myself. I found that there was a very wholesome flame proceeding from it; and certainly much more heat was given out than from the fireplace at the other end of the room. That, however, is only one branch of the subject. My Lords, since I first brought this subject before your Lordships' House, I have been inundated with suggestions, practical and unpractical, of all sorts and kinds. I have seen articles in almost every paper in the daily Press on the subject—many of them, I confess, not very encouraging to anyone who wishes to act as a reformer in this matter; but some pointing out that science has defined various remedies, any one or more of which might be adopted. And there is one remedy, at all events, within our reach. If we only agreed, by legislation, to say that all future grates should be so constructed as to consume their own smoke, and that all future ovens should be rendered smokeless, you would, at once, have done a great deal to cope with the increase of the evil which is daily going on. Had such a measure been adopted, which the Smoke Prevention Act suggested, and put into force 30 years ago, the air of London would now be comparatively pure. The great mischief has been done, not so much by the ordinary chimney as by the kitchen chimney, which must be in every house; and a very slight alteration indeed in many cases would entirely prevent the smoke and the deleterious action issuing therefrom. I merely mention these facts to prove that there is a distinct case to inquire into; and

*Viscount Middleton*

I believe that such an inquiry, if there is not to be a Royal Commission, might effectually and efficiently be carried on by a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament. Those are the views I venture to submit to your Lordships. I gave the Home Office private notice of the question I was about to put three or four days ago; and I hope no objection will be placed in the way if it be possible to form a Joint Committee of both Houses to inquire into this important matter. I do not say that such a Committee would be entirely, or perhaps even partly, successful; but I do say that the subject is one which touches the comfort and health of so large a portion of the community that we ought not to sit down with hands folded, and say that nothing can be done, until it has been proved, beyond all manner of doubt, that the evil is one which is irremediable, and with which it is impossible for us to deal.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, in the first place, I must be allowed to congratulate my noble Friend upon the valuable auxiliary that he obtained this morning to the arguments which he desires to press upon the House and upon the public. Not all the eloquence of my noble Friend was equal to that very dirty fog which we found upon coming into London this morning, and which made me feel a wish that it were possible by any means, Royal Commission or other, to further my noble Friend's desires. But I am afraid the facts are too strong for us. I am not going through the arguments that my noble Friend repeated, with great force, upon the evils or the remediability of the London fog. I am afraid lest I should be considered to be an advocate and friend of the fog—anything more near an *advocatus diaboli* I cannot imagine. But, on the present occasion, I have not to argue the larger question. My noble Friend has gone off the safe field of Committees of this House and Royal Commissions into an unknown country—into the question of Joint Committees. He is touching the mysterious parts of the Constitution. I do not exactly know what the principles are

pon which Joint Committees are appointed, but I know that the suggestion of them is very apt to be ill received on the other side of the central Hall. I remember some years ago, when the noble Lords opposite were in power and had a large majority in the House of Commons, they proposed that the Indian Budget should be referred to a Joint Committee; was a very reasonable proposal; but all the authority of Mr. Gladstone's Government of that day could not induce the House of Commons to accept it. And I am told that it is exceedingly unlikely that the House of Commons would accept a Joint Committee on this subject. hitherto Joint Committees; with I think only one exception, have been confined to questions concerning the private Business of the two Houses. I will not undertake, on behalf of the House of Commons, that they would assent to a Joint Committee; I should give an undertaking which I should be wholly incapable of fulfilling; but I will undertake this: that if anyone moves in the House of Commons for a Joint Committee, and that House accepts it, I will do my best to persuade your Lordships' House to join with the House of Commons in entering upon it. I cannot do more than that. My Lords, much of my noble Friend's remarks were addressed to the point that the House of Commons could not accept any measure that did not initiate with them. If that is the case, the proper course is clearly for my noble Friend to induce one of his many adherents in the other House to move for a Committee in that House, and I daresay he would move it with success. But I do not quite understand the modesty which induces my noble Friend to abstain from going forward in that path of investigation which has here selected. After all, the main point is to collect information, and that information will be good enough whichever House it comes from; will not matter which House has put it into the Blue Book; and, if my noble Friend can get together, by examination in Committee, an amount of evidence which shows that there is an effective remedy for this evil, and at that remedy can be applied by

Parliament, I will venture to say that the House of Commons will attach just as much importance to that evidence as if it were gathered by themselves.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 25th February, 1892.

### QUESTIONS.

#### JURORS AT IRISH ASSIZES.

MR. MULHOLLAND (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to resolutions unanimously passed by almost every Board of Guardians in Ulster, protesting against the existing system of summoning jurors to the Assizes without remuneration, or compensation for actual pecuniary loss incurred; and whether it is his intention to introduce a clause into the Local Government Bill for the purpose of removing this grievance?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): Resolutions such as are referred to in the question have been received from Boards of Guardians. There is no intention of introducing a clause in reference to the subject into the Local Government Bill.

MR. LEA (Londonderry, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I have given notice of a Motion for a Select Committee on the subject? Will the Government state now if they are willing to grant that Committee?

MR. JACKSON: I have not heard anything about a Committee. I am not aware that there are any differences between jurors in Ireland and in England. I am afraid that to serve as jurors is a sacrifice that has to be made by citizens in either country.

#### OPIUM CULTIVATION IN BENGAL.

SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India

whether he can state the number of acres licensed for poppy cultivation in Bengal in each year from 1880-81 to 1889-90, both inclusive; the number included in the revised Estimate for 1890-91, and in the Budget Estimate for 1891-2; the amount of Malwa revenue included in the revised Estimate of Rx.5,680,300 for 1890-91, and the amount of Malwa revenue included in the Budget Estimate for 1891-2 of Rx.5,318,000?

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire. Southport): For the ten years, the extent of poppy cultivation is in acres. 1880-81, 536,017; 1881-82, 531,275; 1882-83, 495,740; 1883-84, 505,843; 1884-85, 565,246; 1885-86, 594,921; 1886-87, 562,052; 1887-88, 536,607; 1888-89, 459,864; 1889-90, 482,557; in 1890-91 it was 500,688. The figures for 1891-92 have not yet been received, but in order to restrict the area of cultivation, the Government of India reduced the number of chests for sale in the year from 57,000 to 54,000. As to the revenue, the Malwa contribution was estimated at Rx.1,747,000 in both of the years named by the hon. Baronet.

#### THE STRANRAER MAILS

MR. MULHOLLAND (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to the statement publicly made by the Chairman of the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, on 12th February, that his Company were able and willing to carry the Mails between Stranraer and Londonderry in half an hour less time than they had undertaken by the recently concluded agreement; whether he can state how often the Mail Train for the North of Ireland has been more than ten minutes' late in arriving at Carlisle and at Stranraer since the establishment of the accelerated Mail service on 1st September, 1891; and whether he has taken any steps with the object of enforcing reasonable punctuality in the delivery of the mails at Stranraer by the English and Scotch Railway Companies concerned?

*Sir Joseph Pease*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): Attention has been directed to the statement referred to, and the Department would be glad to have the Mails carried between Stranraer and Derry in half-an-hour less time than at present. But it is understood that the Company make the proviso that a punctual arrival of the Mail Train at Stranraer shall be "ensured," and the Department is, of course, not in a position to guarantee absolute punctuality. Since the establishment of the Service on the 1st September last, the Mail Train has been more than 10 minutes late at Carlisle on 69 occasions, and more than 10 minutes late at Stranraer on 101 occasions. In 50 of these cases the irregularity has exceeded 15 minutes, and in almost every instance in which there has been great delay, it has been due either to an accident or to the severity of the weather. Urgent representations have, however, been addressed to the Railway Companies concerned, both as regards the general service and also in view of particular cases of delay, and they have promised to make every effort to secure punctuality. As I have already stated, the speed is high, 40 miles an hour over all, for 406 miles, with about 70 miles of single line in Scotland. There is heavy work to be done at the stations, including a growing Parcel Post; and, in the circumstances, absolute punctuality is difficult to maintain.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Does the delay arise chiefly on the English or Irish side?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: The delay, as I have said, arises on the English and Scotch lines.

#### ARMY PENSIONS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether soldiers of over 50 years, who have served twelve years with the colours, are entitled to have their names entered at Chelsea Hospital for a deferred pension under the Warrant of 1847?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): To be entitled to a deferred pension from the age of 50

years a soldier must have enlisted before 23rd July, 1864, and must have been discharged with two good conduct badges after not less than 14 years' service.

MAJOR RASCH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, will he have that fact more generally made known?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I will inquire, and see if it is necessary to advertise it further.

#### CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM IN INDIA.

MR. LEWIS FRY (Bristol, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a statement of the consumption of opium and its preparation in British India for the year 1890-1, similar to that for the previous ten years, contained in Statement B appended to the letter from the Government of India, dated 14th October last, recently made public; and whether the figures in Statement B refer to annual periods expiring on 31st March in each year; and, if so, whether he can explain why Statement B does not comprise the figures for the year ending 31st March, 1891?

\*MR. CURZON: No, Sir; the figures for 1890-1, in continuation of Statement B, have not yet been received from the Governor of India; but they will be laid on the Table as soon as they are received. In the meanwhile, I can give the hon. Member the figures as they appear in the Provincial Reports for all Provinces except Madras and the North West Provinces. The annual periods in Statement B expire on 31st March, except in the case of the North West Provinces, where they expire on 30th September. Statement B was sent home with the Governor of India's despatch of 14th October, 1891, when the figures for 1890-1 were not available in a complete form.

#### PRESBYTERIAN ARMY CHAPLAINS.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received the Report of a Committee of the Free Church of Scotland (since approved by the General Assembly) on the subject of Presbyterian Army Chaplains, in which it was suggested that the superintendence of

the work shall be carried on by a Committee representing all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, and ministers of all the Presbyterian Churches shall be eligible as chaplains; and whether, in view of the fact that the scheme proposed, besides providing much greater efficiency, will also secure economy, and that under the scheme the Presbyterian Churches undertake to supply all additional service needed beyond that provided by the fixed maximum expenditure of £800 per annum, he will give his favourable consideration to these proposals, with a view to their early adoption?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: Yes; I have received the Report in question; but I have no means of knowing whether the suggestions contained in it are acceptable to all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. Until I know this is the case, I am not in a position to consider the suggestions of the Report.

#### THE COASTGUARD O'HALLORAN AT EASTBOURNE.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will cause a strict inquiry to be made into the case of a coastguard man, recently stationed at Eastbourne, by name O'Halloran, who has just been pensioned out of the Service on two shillings per day, to which he was entitled by length of service, with a gratuity of only £3 as a compensation for 15 months of bodily suffering, due to a terrible accident on a dark night in November, 1890, when on patrol duty, and which has reduced him to the position of a helpless invalid for life; whether he is aware that, owing to the fence round the Redoubt at the east end of the town being of insufficient height, the coastguardman, who had only been about 48 hours at the station, stumbled over the fence and fell into the ditch, a distance of about 25 to 30 feet, and that he was after a time sent to Haslar and treated on the surgical side, and then on the medical side, and ultimately discharged as cured, whereas results show he ought not to have been discharged; whether he is aware that the man cannot be received into the Princess Alice Hospital at Eastbourne because of his

Board of Agriculture whether he can give the House any information regarding the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis; whether he can say when it held its last sitting; whether the Minutes of Evidence given before the Commission have been printed and distributed; whether he is aware of the anxiety with which its Report is waited for by those whose industry may be vitally affected by its recommendations; and when he expects it to report?

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am informed that the Royal Commission held its last meeting on the 28th of January last; but I may observe that investigations are being carried on in addition to the taking of evidence at the meetings of the Commission. Minutes of the evidence given before the Commission have been printed for the use of the Commissioners, but the evidence has not been distributed to the public. I do not under-estimate the interest with which the Report of the Commission is awaited, but I am not in a position to state when their investigations are likely to be concluded.

#### THE PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS.

MR. LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the "conditions," upon which tenders were invited for printing and publishing the Parliamentary Reports of Debates and Proceedings, stipulated that the first edition should be issued in daily parts, stitched, "without covers"; and whether the tenderers were informed that permission would be subsequently given to the successful competitor for the contract to issue that edition in covers, and with advertisements, yielding a larger profit than the subsidy?

SIR JOHN GORST (Chatham): The answer to the first question is, Yes; to the second No.

#### THE POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that letters posted at Dublin for Castlecomer, County Kilkenny, are usually sent by train to Thurles and thence per mail car to Castlecomer; and whether, in view of the fact that there was no mail service between Thurles and Castlecomer for

*Mr. Furness*

a number of days from the 19th instant, and considering the great inconvenience caused to the public by the interruption of the mail service, he will in future, in case of a block on the ordinary mail road, give directions to have the mails from Dublin to Castlecomer forwarded by way of Urlingford, Freshford, or Ballyragget, or by some of the other roads which are always open to traffic?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: The mails for Castlecomer are sent in the manner described, the railway to Castlecomer not being used, because there is no convenient train available for the service. The mails arrive in ordinary course, by car, at 7 a.m. The recent very exceptionable snowfall caused both roads and railways to be blocked in many parts of the district; and inquiry is being made into the question of adopting the route mentioned in the event of any similar emergency in future.

#### THE BRAZILIAN AND ARGENTINE REPUBLICS.

MR. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will lay upon the Table copies of any recent laws passed by the Brazilian and Argentine Republics respecting the naturalisation of foreigners?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: A translation of Chapter 69 of the Constitution of the Brazilian Republic, which contains the Brazilian Law on Nationality, will be laid upon the Table. With reference to the Argentine Republic, a Bill on naturalisation was before the Chamber of Deputies last year, but, so far as Her Majesty's Government are informed, it has not yet been passed into law.

#### THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF ARGENTINA.

MR. BAUMANN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Report of Mr. Arthur Herbert, Secretary of Legation at Buenos Ayres, upon the financial condition of Argentina, has been published; and, if not, whether he will lay it upon the Table?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: The proof of the Report has been sent to Mr.

Herbert, in order that he might have the opportunity of revising it before publication. It is hoped that it will shortly be received back from him, and the Report will then be laid upon the Table.

#### THE SCOTCH EDUCATION CODE.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Bollox): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate when Members may expect to see the Scotch Education Code, which was laid upon the Table of the House in "dummy" on the 15th instant?

SIR C. J. PEARSON: The Code was delivered to Members at the Vote Office on the 23rd February.

#### AGRICULTURAL RETURNS FOR ENGLAND.

MR. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is responsible for the annual publication of the Agricultural Return for England, the collection of which is forced on another Department; if he is aware that those Returns are notoriously unreliable, owing to the inability of Excise officers to collect them on account of their revenue duties, the objection of farmers to give the required information, and the want of provision by Act of Parliament to make the information compulsory; if those Returns could not be collected with less cost and more accuracy by overseers, who are willing to undertake the work; and whether he was informed, on taking office, of the unreliability of those Returns?

MR. CHAPLIN: The Board of Agriculture are responsible for the publication of the Agricultural Returns, which are collected by the Inland Revenue Department. Regarding the character of the Returns, the opinions of the officers whose duty it is to examine them are quite adverse to the view expressed in the question. The work of collection is one of considerable magnitude, and it is considered that, on the whole, it is exceedingly well done. I do not consider that the Returns could be collected, either with less cost or more accuracy, by overseers. I believe that whatever objection may have prevailed at one time on

the part of farmers and others to render the Returns has practically disappeared; and I am satisfied to rely on the increased recognition by agriculturists of the value of the statistics obtained without resorting to further powers. Since I took office I have on one or two occasions, I believe, received letters criticising the accuracy of the Returns; but, upon inquiry, I am satisfied that this view is not supported by the facts.

#### NORTH PARK, ELTHAM.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the Commissioners of Woods and Forests have declined to name a price for North Park, Eltham; if so, whether they will not re-consider that resolution, and leave some time for negotiation before letting it out for building or cutting down the old timber?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (SIR JOHN GORST): The Commissioners of Woods and Forests have not declined to name a price for North Park, Eltham, but they could not do this without a valuation, of which any intending purchaser would have to guarantee the cost.

#### IRISH RATING LAW AND BOARDS OF GUARDIANS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether there have been any, and, if so, how many, cases in which the abuse of rating powers under the Poor Law in Ireland has called for the interference of the Central Authority; and whether it is possible under the Irish Rating Law for a Board of Guardians to abuse its rating powers?

MR. JACKSON: With regard to the matter of fact referred to in the first paragraph, the Local Government Board report that there have been several cases in which Boards of Guardians fail to strike adequate rates, with the result that the unions are in debt at the end of their financial year. I am unable to advise respecting the subject-matter of the second paragraph.

### THE PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT.

MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the rules directed by Sec. 27 of "The Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891," will be issued; and when the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Treasury propose to make known their decision under Sec. 28, Sub-Sec. 7, of the same Act?

MR. JACKSON: The rules are prepared, and will shortly be laid upon the Table. The Treasury has already approved the recommendations of the Lord Lieutenant under Section 28 (7). Perhaps the House will allow me to make a short explanation with regard to a portion of my speech in reply to the Amendment to the Address, moved by the hon. Member for West Belfast. I find that in some quarters I have been supposed to have implied that there had been delay on the part of the Land Commission in issuing rules under the Purchase of Land Act, 1891. I thought, and I think hon. Members who were present will agree with me, that it was clear that the rules about which I was then speaking were the Treasury rules referred to in the question of the hon. Member for West Cavan, which has just been answered. As a matter of fact, as was stated in my speech, the rules for which the Land Commissioners were responsible were issued within ten days after the passing of the Act.

### PENSIONS TO IRISH TEACHERS.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he could lay soon upon the Table a Return showing the calculations on which the present issue of pensions to Irish teachers is based, and also Returns showing why such calculations are now held to be insufficient without reinforcing the reserve by £90,000 of Irish money?

MR. JACKSON: The subject-matter of this question is one for the Treasury rather than the Irish Government. But I have no doubt the hon. and gallant Member will receive full information on the matter when the Supplementary Estimate dealing with the £90,000 is before the House.

### THE IRISH EDUCATION BILL.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when will the Irish Education Bill be distributed?

MR. JACKSON: I am anxious that the Irish Education Bill should be in the hands of Members as soon as possible, and every effort is being made to have it immediately distributed.

### INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the charge of 3s. 7d. for each certificate of birth which has to be paid by children intending to compete at the intermediate examinations in Ireland, whether the Government will telegraph immediate instructions to the registrars in Ireland to charge only a nominal fee (as is done in England under the Elementary Education Act), in view of the fact that these certificates must be procured before the end of the present month?

MR. JACKSON: The charge of 3s. 7d. is, I find, a statutable fee, and even if considered advisable, there is no power to adopt the course suggested in the question. It is, moreover, to be borne in mind that such fees are the only sources of income of the superintendent registrars, and that the ability to pay on the part of intermediate education candidates is far greater than that of those coming under the elementary education system.

### OPEN AIR MEETINGS IN LONDON.

MR. JAMES ROWLANDS (Finsbury, East): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will grant a Return of the places available for open air meeting in London, referred to by him in his answer to the deputation on Tuesday?

MR. MATTHEWS: I have no objection to give a Return of the places where open air meetings can lawfully be held in the Metropolis, and I will lay it on the Table in a day or two, or as soon as it can be prepared.

### TUNNEL RAILWAYS IN THE METROPOLIS.

**MR. T. H. BOLTON** (St. Pancras, North): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will arrange to refer all Bills before Parliament relating to tunnel railways in the Metropolis, to a Hybrid Committee or to a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament, with power to consider the policy to be adopted with regard to such railways, and the conditions and regulations to be applied to the same in the interest of the public?

**\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It has been usual for a Bill of this kind to be referred to a Hybrid Committee, but it is a matter for the House itself to decide.

### UNCLAIMED BALANCES OF DECEASED SOLDIERS.

**MR. HANBURY** (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the total unclaimed balances of deceased soldiers now amount to a considerable sum, many of them exceeding £20 in the case of individual soldiers; and in what newspapers commonly read by soldiers and their relatives are these balances and the names of the soldiers leaving them published, and how often annually?

**\*MR. E. STANHOPE**: The unclaimed balances of deceased soldiers amount to a considerable sum; and, after being advertised for seven years, are handed over to the Royal Patriotic Fund for distribution in accordance with the Regimental Debts Act. Balances of individual estates frequently exceed £20. The balances are advertised in the *London Gazette* and in the monthly *Army List*; and the lists are exposed at the headquarters of regimental districts. Very little practical result was found to be brought about by advertising in newspapers.

### PENSIONERS AND RESERVE MEN EMPLOYED BY THE WAR OFFICE.

**MR. HANBURY** (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any reduction of, or deduction from, the usual wages is made in any of the departments or factories connected with the War Office in the case

of pensioners or Reserve men; and, whether, irrespective of their pension or Reserve pay, these men receive the same treatment in all respects when in Government employment as an ordinary civilian doing similar work would receive?

**\*MR. E. STANHOPE**: There is no distinction in any respect between the treatment accorded in any department of Army administration to pensioners and Reserve men as compared with civilians employed on similar work. If my hon. Friend is aware of any case leading to a contrary impression I shall be glad if he will bring it to my notice.

### COSTS IN CHANCERY SUITS.

**MR. DUNCAN** (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether his attention has been called to the case of *Essen v. Weldon*, in which it was shown that in the course of an administration suit in the Chancery Division an estate of more than £2,000 net had been reduced by costs to such an extent that no more than £280 was left for the residuary legatee; and whether he is prepared to offer some proposal for the amendment of the procedure in administration of estates in Chancery, so devised that it will not be possible to swallow up small estates in costs?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): The hon. Member has been entirely misinformed as to the circumstances alluded to in the question. The actual amount of the money paid into Court was £2,139. Of this sum no less than £1,465 was paid away to 40 different creditors of the intestate. The whole costs incurred were £435 8s. 1d., of which £202 were the costs of the executors and residuary legatee herself. The costs were, I think, certainly increased by reason of there being a dispute between the parties interested, the will being in favour of a person who was no relation of the deceased, his wife and family being entirely excluded. The Lord Chancellor proposed last year and hopes again to introduce a measure for dealing specially with the administration of small estates, and he is now being assisted by a Committee of Judges with reference thereto.



## THE BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, West): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, with regard to the Supplementary Estimate for the Mombasa and Nyassa Railway, whether he will state to the House how much of the money has been spent and how much of the survey completed; and whether the money is paid to the surveyors and engineers employed, or to the British East Africa Company?

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): My right hon. Friend has asked me to reply. I have to say that the preliminary survey for the Mombasa and Victoria Nyanza Railway was begun in December last, and that the latest information which we have received shows that, on 22nd January, the surveying parties had reached a point on the Tzavo river about 150 miles from the coast. When the Supplementary Estimate for this survey was withdrawn at the end of last Session under circumstances which will be in the recollection of the House, I stated in the strongest terms that the withdrawal was not to be held to imply any change in the policy of the Government. The action we took was as follows:—We made arrangements with the company that they should proceed with the survey, the expenses being met by them, and the Government, on their part, giving a pledge that they would ask the House to vote the money at the earliest opportunity, in order to reimburse the company for expenditure upon the expedition to the amount of £20,000. Under this arrangement the cost of the survey has hitherto been met by the company, and none of the money which the House is asked to vote has been actually spent. The money, when voted, will be paid to the British East Africa Company. I should add that the company is responsible for the conduct of the expedition, but that the engineer in charge of the survey, Captain Macdonald, R.E., is appointed by the Government, and will make a Report to the Government.

SIR W. HARCOURT (Derby): Before this Vote is taken I should like to know whether the Government propose to lay on the Table any papers relating to East Africa and the East Africa Company, and their relations with the Government, and the territory through which the railway will go? What I ask is whether the Government propose to offer to the House any information with reference to the undertaking generally?

MR. GOSCHEN: We hope that papers on the survey and the territories through which the railway would pass will be in the hands of hon. Members to-morrow. I think they contain full details of the cost of the survey. I cannot promise papers as to the standing of the East Africa Company, and I do not know if such papers exist, but I hope the House will feel that the Government have afforded all necessary and proper information for the discussion of the Vote.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: What about Captain Lugard's Report?

\*MR. GOSCHEN: I do not know that Captain Lugard has reported in any way to Her Majesty's Government, and I do not think his Report bears on this particular question. Certainly Her Majesty's Government have no official cognisance of him in the matter, but inquiries will be made.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It was a Report to the East India Company last year, and it purported to be a preliminary survey of the whole of this country. I should like to know whether that Report will be laid upon the Table?

\*MR. GOSCHEN: I will certainly see that that shall be done, if it can be conveniently done.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): Will the Charter be included in the papers?

MR. GOSCHEN: No.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): What is the expenditure incurred by the Company?

\*MR. GOSCHEN: We have no knowledge of the amount spent on the survey up to date, and, the expenditure having taken place in Africa, I doubt whether the Company themselves know what it has been. We have, however, had a most careful estimate prepared, which puts the amount at

from between £16,000 and £18,000 to upwards of £20,000. Every care has been taken to secure the accuracy of that estimate. As to the Charter, I am not sure that I can undertake to lay it on the Table to-morrow, but I would remind the House that the money asked for is only for the preliminary survey, and does not in any way pledge the House to any future action.

**MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton): Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to tell us what is the precise financial position of the Chartered Company at the present moment, and also, in view of his statement that papers are to be laid on the Table, may we not take it for granted that the vote will come on to-night?

**MR. MORTON** (Peterborough): I understand that the Government have not yet spent any of this money. May I ask have they in any way pledged the consent of this country to any portion of it before getting the consent of the House?

**MR. GOSCHEN**: We have pledged ourselves to the company to submit this estimate to the House, and we shall do our best to pass it. We have entered into no contract with the company to pay any money. The company has itself undertaken this survey at a considerable expense, and we shall ask the House to grant money to reimburse part of the expense. It would be very convenient that the House should take the Supplementary Estimates up to this point this evening, so that this Vote might stand first on the paper for the next sitting, as it will, I doubt, interest Members in all parts of the House.

#### THE VETERINARY DEPARTMENT.

**MR. LAWSON** (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, having regard to the uncertainty of outbreaks of contagious disease requiring the vigilance of the Veterinary Department, he will take steps to obtain the whole time of the Director and Officers of the Department?

**MR. CHAPLIN**: I am informed by Professor Brown, the Director of the

Veterinary Branch of the Department over which I preside, that at the present moment he holds the positions of Principal of the Royal Veterinary College and Lecturer upon Cattle Pathology. Professor Brown has, however, resigned the Lectureship, and his resignation will take effect at the end of the current term, but he proposes to retain the Principalship of the College, without salary, although it is possible that some honorarium may be assigned to him. Notwithstanding the fact that Professor Brown has held the appointments referred to, it has always been recognised by him that his whole time is at the disposal of the Board. It has always been considered that Professor Brown's connection with the College has been of the greatest service to the Department, inasmuch as it has enabled him to keep constantly in touch with the most recent scientific work. No other officer of the Veterinary Department holds any other salaried professional appointment, and in every case the officer's whole time is available for the work of the Board. During the recent outbreak the services of the veterinary staff have been constantly available, both in and out of office hours, every day.

#### THE GOVERNMENT CLOTHING FACTORY, PIMLICO.

**MR. SYDNEY BUXTON**: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the rate of wages paid to cutters at the Government Factory, Pimlico, and the number of hours per week worked by them; when the last rise of wages or reduction of hours took place; and whether he is aware that the wages of cutters outside Government employment have been materially raised within the last fifteen years, and that the almost universal practice in the trade now is to pay cutters wages of 40s. for a week of 50 hours?

\***MR. E. STANHOPE**: Cutters at the Clothing Factory on the best class of work receive from 36s. to 39s. a week; there are some employed on inferior work who receive 30s. a week. The hours of work per week are 54. Wages and hours have not varied for fifteen years. Inquiries have been made into

the practice in the trade outside, and I am informed that when the continuity of employment, the leave with pay, medical attendance, and other advantages are taken into account, the Government employment compares favourably with any to be obtained in the private trade.

#### OVERLOADING PROSECUTIONS.

MR. STAVELEY HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can inform the House how many prosecutions for overloading have been instituted by the Board of Trade since he became President; the number of convictions obtained; and what has been the total cost to the Department of these prosecutions?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Between 18th February, 1888, and the present date, there have been 88 prosecutions for submerging load-line discs (in contravention of Section 28 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876), and convictions have resulted in 77 cases. During the same period 53 prosecutions in connection with 52 vessels (39 Foreign and 13 British) have been instituted for breaches of Section 24 of the same Act, in bringing illegal deck cargoes into ports in the United Kingdom, and 50 convictions have been obtained. Proceedings have been instituted against eight British and three foreign ships for proceeding to sea in defiance of detention for overloading, or improper loading, and convictions obtained under Section 34 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, in ten cases. Leaving out of consideration a few unsettled accounts, the total cost of the prosecutions to which I have referred has been under £1,200.

#### THE INSPECTION OF THE RIVER SHANNON.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what has been done since the inspection of the River Shannon by Mr. Berrington, the English Inspector of Fisheries, to prevent the injuries likely to be caused by the drainage works being executed by the Board of Works to the fisheries of that river; and, if he will lay upon

*Mr. E. Stanhope.*

the Table copies of any correspondence between the Board of Works, the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, the Conservators of Fisheries of the Limerick District, or the Government on the subject since the date of Mr. Berrington's Report?

SIR JOHN GORST: I am informed that the Board of Works has requested the Fishery Inspectors to get their own engineer to make a thorough examination of all the works, with the view of preventing such injuries as are suggested in the question. There is no correspondence at this stage which I can lay on the Table of the House.

#### SALMON FISHERIES.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether Lord Ventry has established his right to a general fishery near Brandon, County Kerry, within half a-mile from the mouth of the river Clohane; if not, why has he not been prosecuted, as a number of fishermen have been, for netting within the half-mile limit? Was this prosecution of the fishermen conducted in the names of the Clerk of the Limerick District Board of Conservators at Lord Ventry's instance, and did the skipper of Lord Ventry's boat receive a portion of the fines; and do the Crown admit Lord Ventry's title or his right to the fines; and, if not, will he be prosecuted for netting within the half-mile limit, like other fishermen, until his alleged rights are legally established?

MR. MADDEN: I am informed that Lord Ventry's fishery extends to within half a-mile of the river Clohane. The prosecutions referred to were undertaken by the Clerk to the Limerick Board of Conservators; and the fishermen employed by Lord Ventry, having been the informants, received a portion of the fines. So far as proceedings are concerned against Lord Ventry to establish his claim, the Inspectors of Fisheries do not contemplate taking such a course.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman what is the position of the Crown in this matter. Lord Ventry enjoys several fisheries in these waters. Does the Crown recognise his right? Is it to be

ten that because Lord Ventry puts private Board in motion that he himself is entitled by the mere assertion of these rights to have other subjects of Her Majesty fined, and that a Crown will stand idly by without quiring as to his rights?

MR. MADDEN: No facts have come to my notice to suggest any question as to the validity of Lord Ventry's rights, and I do not see why a Government should interfere in the matter.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Does the right hon. Gentleman, on behalf of the Crown, consider that Lord Ventry owns these fisheries to the exclusion of other subjects of Her Majesty? Is Lord Ventry any title to this fish?

MR. MADDEN: It is not the duty of the Government to call on persons to assert and prove their right to property of which they are in the enjoyment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to enter a prosecution to be instituted against Lord Ventry, so that if Lord Ventry raises the question of title the matter could be taken to a superior court?

MR. MADDEN: I think the hon. learned Gentleman must see the reasonableness of his suggestion, that without any facts whatever before me should order these proceedings. If any person disputes Lord Ventry's title it is open to him to take proceedings.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Can the right hon. Gentleman intervene to prevent the Limerick Board of Conservators being prosecutors, and instruct them to leave Lord Ventry to assert his title?

MR. MADDEN: I have no control whatever over the Limerick Board of conservators, nor has any Department of the Government.

#### ORD KENMARE AND HIS TENANTRY.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been called to the proceedings at Bantry Quarter Sessions early in February, at which a tenant named John Keohane brought an action against Edward Godfrey, P.L.G.,

estate bailiff to Lord Kenmare, for illegal seizures and distraint of cattle. Is he aware that it was proved at these proceedings that Lord Kenmare used to charge 12s. for every distress warrant against his tenants, whether executed or not, and appropriated these illegal charges to his own use; and, in view of the fact that Lord Kenmare is a justice of the peace, as well as his agent, Mr. Maurice Leonard, will the Lord Chancellor take notice of these proceedings?

MR. MADDEN: I must ask the hon. Gentleman to postpone his question till to-morrow.

#### MEMBERS' LETTERS.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will explain upon what principle Members of this House are charged additional fees upon letters addressed to the House of Commons, but which are re-directed to the Member's private address; and, if he will consider the propriety of redressing this grievance by abolishing these additional fees?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: Members' letters have no privilege of postage, and, when re-directed, are liable to charge like other letters, except when they are re-directed to an address within the same postal delivery as the original address. Re-direction of letters from the House of Commons to any address within the London area is made, therefore, without charge, but, if the second address is beyond the London area, the letters are liable to charge for re-direction. It is, however, in contemplation to abolish the re-direction charges on letters generally.

#### THE CASE OF MR. MONTAGU.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Constabulary Sergeant Shier, of Portstewart, twice visited the house of Mr. Montagu, J.P., on the 14th instant, the day after the death of his child, Mary Helen Montagu, and obtained full information as to the cause of death, and the name of Mrs. Montagu, mother of the child, as the person alleged to have caused the death; whether the information so obtained was communicated to District

without the money, I think we may take it from this. But if the Estimates are looked into, I think it will be found that the other parts of the Empire have an advantage over us in respect of money given to the Universities; and I think that it ought to be taken out of the ordinary expenditure for the year. As for the rest of the money, as I have said, the Government give it in relief of rates. For want of any more definite claim on the part of the Scotch people, I should have been content to see it given over to the Town Councils and County Councils, but for definite purposes which could not otherwise be met out of the rates. And, at any rate, I would at least bargain for this: that if the proposal of the Government be adopted, if the money is to be given over to the Town Councils and County Councils, surely they need not be tied down to apply it for the relief of the rates. I think we might at least strike out these words "for the relief of the rates" from the Vote which is on the Table when we come to deal with the definite words, and leave it to the discretion of Town Councils and County Councils. These are the observations which occur to me. I cannot express too strongly my opinion that the whole of these proceedings are slipshod finance, and slipshod administration. That is not our fault. We have to make the best of it. I have said that the proposal to hand over the money for the relief of rates for the present year may be accepted. It may be inevitable in the present state of public opinion, but we should be slow to pledge ourselves, by actual statute, either to any fixed sum, or to objects which we are not certain will satisfy the Scotch people.

\*(5.45.) MR. RONALD C. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith, &c.): I think the majority of the Scotch Members who have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down will agree very heartily with the expressions which he has used in regard to this Bill; and I sincerely hope that this may be the last time we shall be called upon in this House to discuss an equivalent grant. When a generous Government scatters bounty over the land like this we find that the

money is wasted, and we find that the local administration becomes entirely disorganised. Now, with regard to the specific proposals of the Government, I also very much regret that no place has been found amongst them with regard to primary education. So far as secondary education is concerned, I believe that we are not yet provided with a plan which would warrant such large expenditure as is sometimes proposed for that very necessary branch of education, but a large sum may very well be voted for that purpose. Again, with regard to technical education we find no provision whatever made under the proposals of the Government; and so far from making any provision for it, the County Councils are absolutely prohibited from undertaking further work in connection with this case. The County Council with which I am connected myself have shown no disposition to spend this grant in relief of the rates. As it is desirous of carrying on technical education, and as there are quarters in England where the sum of £750,000 has been spent by County Councils in connection with agricultural and other forms of education, I feel that in Scotland we will be placed at a very serious disadvantage if we are to be prohibited from undertaking a work which is doing so much good throughout the whole of the counties of England. The Universities are to be given £30,000, and, knowing as I do the necessity for a grant of that character, I must confess that I do not see my way to oppose it in any form whatever. But, at the same time, I should be very much surprised to find much enthusiasm on behalf of this proposal amongst hon. Members on this side. Our chief knowledge of the Universities on this side is that we find their representatives ranged against us upon every possible occasion, and instead of men of science or men of high culture being sent to represent the Universities here, we find a lawyer or a politician coming to this House in order to pursue Party purposes. I do not think that this is a recommendation which will enable hon. Members on this side of the House to receive the proposals of the Government as well as they might otherwise

*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*

At the same time, I think that as has been said, that the University funds should come from the ordinary taxation of the country, is extremely ; and I think that the money for Universities ought to have come of the Treasury in the ordinary way instead of that in which it now comes before the House, The £25,000 which is to go to the relief of charge for the pauper lunatics would also come under the same head. A statement has been put forward by the Parochial Board which demands that some contribution should be made towards the support of the pauper lunatics. It shows that the rate in Scotland amounts to about 4s. a week, while in England it is fixed at 4s. a week. I think here, again, it is not an occasion for making demand upon the equivalent grant, it is an occasion demanding that the Chancellor of the Exchequer shall treat Scotland upon equal terms with England. With regard to the expenditure on medical relief and those other matters, they should more properly come before the Committee on the equalisation of the burdens of local taxation in different parts of the United Kingdom which is now sitting. I entirely agree with what my right hon. Friend has said in regard to the objects to which it should be obligatory upon the Local Authorities to give the money that should come to them under this grant. I think some good might be done if this money were put for public libraries, for baths, for improvement of public parks, and for other necessary purposes, such as technical education, or in the construction of harbours or new works, which are very much required. In Essex-shire the demand for new docks and harbours is very great. I think these are matters to which we ought perfectly well to devote the money which is to come to us under the proposals of the Government. The whole system of these grants I think is entirely unsatisfactory ; and as these miscellaneous bounties descending upon us lead to a very bad system of administration, I sincerely trust that we will have the last occasion upon which this will be done. I think there has been an immense amount of money wasted,

and I think it upsets the whole system of Imperial finance.

\*(5.53.) MR. JAMES SOMERVELL (Ayr, &c.): We have already taken advantage in Scotland of the grants from Imperial taxation to give free education to Scotland, and the only subject that remains now is to see whether we will adopt the English practice and give this grant entirely to the relief of rates, or whether it is in accordance with the feeling of the people of Scotland, to give a portion to improve the education which has been already made free. I think that the remark of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs as regards this amount being stereotyped is a very forcible one. We were told that this sum of £265,000 is more than originally was calculated would come to Scotland, and, as the calculation was wrong in the past, it very probably will be equally wrong in the future, and as education and the number of children must increase in England, so the share to Scotland will be considerably increased, and I hope, in a few years, will amount to £300,000. If that is the case, I think this measure should state the manner of allocation. It is right that a certain sum should be stereotyped. I think it is perfectly right if the Universities are to receive £30,000, that sum should be definitely fixed. I have very great sympathy with the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs upon this Vote. I think it very hard upon Scotland that this £30,000 should be taken out of this money. I think that money should be given altogether out of the general finances of the country. The right hon. Gentleman rather sneered at the members of the local Town Councils and County Councils in effecting economy and reducing the rates. I would remind him that he is the representative of the same electors as have returned these bodies ; and that, while it is their duty to diminish the rates as far as they can, the same electors would be very thankful if the right hon. Gentleman, in his place in Parliament, would do his utmost to get a grant by which the rates should be reduced. The right

aware, with the unanimous consent of the representatives of Scotland. I hope and believe that the average Scotch ratepayer is a Scotchman first and a ratepayer afterwards, and that if a really strong claim is made for spending a portion of this money for a purpose which is in accordance with the traditions and history of Scotland, and which will result in much benefit at comparatively small expenditure, the ratepayer will be quite willing not only to consider the proposals on their merits, but also to accept them if they are in the direction of the general improvement of the community in which he shares. With reference to the allocation of the £110,000 I have referred to, the Government have considered themselves bound by the indication—to place it no higher—which was given last year with reference to the destination of that money; and therefore we propose in the Bill to hand it over to the Town and County Councils, on the same basis of allocation as was adopted in regard to the Local Taxation grant—on the basis of valuation. I believe, at all events, that the voting of the whole of the money to the Town and County Councils was a thing which had been reckoned upon, and in certain instances reckoned upon practically and acted upon, not altogether without warrant, and therefore I hope there will be a general acquiescence in that mode of dealing with the sum which arises during the current year. With regard to the future, we propose to devote a certain amount to other purposes. The fund, as I have indicated, is more than has been anticipated, and of that amount of £265,000, which will be the amount when on a permanent basis, we propose to allocate £175,000 in relief of rates. Of that sum, £100,000 we propose should go to the Town and County Councils on the same footing as the £110,000 I have already dealt with, and we propose that the balance of £75,000 should be handed to the Parochial Boards, to be applied by them, to the extent of £25,000, towards the cost of maintenance of the pauper lunatics, and as regards the rest of it, namely £50,000, in relief of the local rates levied by those bodies. We believe that will be regarded as no

unsubstantial benefit to the ratepayers in the way of relieving the burdens which have been imposed upon them by the increasing expenses of local administration; and, getting that benefit as they will, we further believe they will be willing, as we think the public opinion of Scotland will be willing, that the remainder of the money should be devoted to other purposes of the nature I have indicated. We therefore propose to devote a large sum out of the balance of £90,000 which remains, to the improvement and development of secondary education. We believe that this object is one which is not only in accord with the traditions of Scotland, but also is one that directly affects every class of the people, and certainly I do not think that the ratepayers of Scotland, considered as a class, will be the persons the least interested in this mode of expending the equivalent grant. I do not believe that there is any class of the community who will be more grateful for it, and I believe, further, they will be quite willing in lieu of the fair fee that many are prepared to give for the higher education of those dependent upon them—they will not be unwilling to grant the benefits of higher education, sought for and obtained through the means of this grant, wisely expended, to those who cannot afford to pay for it. I apprehend one of the objections which may fairly be taken to the present state of things is this, that a child has to be sent to a distance, and perhaps to be boarded, in order to obtain that higher education which, in the belief of many, was practically given under the old system of parochial and burgh schools. It is undoubtedly a hardship in some quarters that the advance and development of elementary education has been accompanied with some amount of detriment to higher education. That development has fallen heavily on the rates, but it has led to the opportunities for secondary education being restricted in more directions than one. I may remind the House as an illustration that the burgh schools were put under the School Board by the Education Act of 1872, but they were not eligible for the grant, and in consequence, the School Boards had a

*Sir C. J. Pearson*

natural disinclination to spend the rates in an undue amount upon them. They have in some instances been conducted with increasing difficulty, and that has led to a certain extent to a decrease in the efficiency; that, again, tends to the increase of the fees, and the result in some cases is that the school goes down, the children attend elsewhere, and the place in which the school is situated is deprived of some, at least, of the advantages it used to enjoy as an educational centre. That is not a fancy picture, but has been realised in certain parts of Scotland, and is within the knowledge of Members on both sides of the House. We propose that the amount to be devoted to this purpose should be £60,000 out of the £90,000, and that the distribution of it should be in accordance with the Minutes of the Education Department to be laid before Parliament. I shall take leave to reserve the more detailed development of what is proposed until a later stage.

DR. CLARK: Do you include Technical Education under Secondary Education?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON: I rather think not, but the hon. Member will take my answer subject to correction. The only features which I should venture to lay before the House at this stage are these: In the first place we desire, as far as possible, to combine those pupils who can pay a moderate fee with those who cannot in this matter of secondary education, and we propose that such conditions should be made as to secure this combination. In the second place, while undoubtedly undue and unfair competition with voluntary schools ought to be avoided as much as possible, yet we believe there may be found, or, if not found, may be created, in the large centres of population particularly, a school under public management that would be the proper recipient of this part of the grant. And in the third place, while we have no desire—but the contrary—to interfere with the development of elementary education, and the increasing thoroughness of it, we believe that the requirements of secondary education will not be fully met without encouraging, where the locality admits of it, and where it is considered fitting to do so,

the higher grade departments in the ordinary schools. These have already been developed satisfactorily, with good results in some places, and although the conditions of the Code are well suited to elementary education, it is felt that they do not adapt themselves so well to the higher or secondary education, and, therefore, that the work in that direction would be conducted more efficiently if such departments formed a portion of a large scheme for the organisation of the higher education of Scotland. Well, the sum I have mentioned as proposed to be devoted to this object is, I am aware, not so large as the most earnest advocates of secondary education might desire; but, at the same time, we have considered the necessities of the case and have inquired into the existing means for the furtherance of this important branch of the educational system of Scotland, and we have come to the conclusion that with the sum I have named we shall be able to do much to stimulate the higher education; to perfect the existing system, and to carry it further in the direction I have indicated, so as to make it more national in its character. There remains a sum of £30,000. The topic to which I have just adverted leads naturally to the Universities of Scotland, and we propose that this balance of £30,000 should be handed over to the Universities of Scotland, to be distributed amongst them in accordance with an ordinance of the existing University Commissioners. It is known to hon. Members that a Commission has been sitting under the Act of 1889, and that they have developed in certain directions schemes which will require additional pecuniary aid to carry them out, and it is thought the sum I have named will go far, if not wholly, to meet the pressing necessities of the case, having regard to the ordinances already presented and about to be issued by the Commissioners; will go so far as to enable these Commissioners to carry through the much desired and much needed reforms of Universities, and therefore the balance of £30,000 we propose to devote to that object in the mode which I have described. That, Sir, is a very brief and imperfect description of the



proposals of the Government in the Bill which I now ask leave to introduce.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to make provision in regard to the Distribution and Application of sums from time to time paid to the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account, and in regard to the fee grant in Scotland."—*(The Lord Advocate.)*

\*(5.15.) MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): I am not unmindful of the presence of my right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means, and of the authoritative admonition which he addressed to us a few nights ago in regard to the imprudence of discussing a Bill before seeing it in print. Upon this occasion I am not quite sure that the prudent course he referred to can altogether be followed, because these are matters with which we are familiar, and the nature of the proposals is such, that I think we are about as well qualified to discuss them now as at any other period in the proceedings. The first observation I have to make affects the form, not the substance, of the proposals by which the Government have thought it right to deal with this matter. They still divide the money that is coming to us into two portions; they deal with these two portions separately. They deal with the money which has accrued in the present financial year differently from the rest of the money. It is not divided between the Universities and secondary education and the Town and County Councils and Parochial Boards, but it is handed over entirely to the County and Town Councils for the relief of the rates. Why should this difference be made? Last year the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor—and I ought, by the way, to thank the right hon. Gentleman for the admirable clearness with which he stated his case—the late Lord Advocate, on the 9th June, broadly stated the various claims that had been made on this money, and he said that it was so difficult to decide between them, and our knowledge, especially on the matter of education, was so imperfect, that the Government would devote the Autumn to the consideration of the matter, and would therefore not proceed with their scheme until this Session. But the

money that was accruing during this year they proposed immediately to deal with. It was regarded as urgent, and, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman said—"As we have not time as regards this £110,000 to consider how it should be apportioned among the various claimants, we will, without prejudicing the course we may take with regard to the annual sum afterwards, simply hand this money over to County Councils and Town Councils for the relief of rates." There was something to be said for that course then; but there is nothing to be said for it now. I cannot see any reason why this sum should not be distributed in the same proportions as it is proposed to apply to the annual income. But something has happened since then, and I wish to call the attention of the House to it. The Government consider themselves pledged to give this £110,000 to Town and County Councils. And why? Because certain Town Councils—I do not know whether any County Councils—have actually proceeded upon the supposition that the money would be given to them. They have reckoned on it in their annual budgets, and if they do not get this money they will have, by a rate, to meet a deficit. This must seem to us a very imprudent and foolish course on the part of a public body. I can quote no higher authority than the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Speaking on the 31st July last year on this very question, he said—alluding to a statement made that action had already been taken upon the view that a particular class of ratepayers would receive it—that the course was premature—

"Because the mere opinion of a Minister that a certain course will be taken cannot be assumed to afford a basis for administrative action."

That is true doctrine, because any other doctrine would involve that this House was to be set aside as of no consequence, that there was no probability of our altering in any way the proposals of the Government, and it even would deny to the Government the opportunity of changing their mind. Therefore, up to this point, we are driven to the conviction that these local bodies have done something very foolish and improper. But that is not so, because

*Sir C. J. Pearson*

what did these local bodies do? The principal among them, the Corporation of Glasgow, had some of its representatives in London. They went to the Scotch Office, and asked the officials of the Scotch Office whether they would be justified in counting upon this money, and they were told that they were justified; they were told the exact amount they would receive; they were informed that cheques were being written out, and thus, upon the mere statement of a Minister that it was the intention of the Government, in an Estimate that had never been before the House, to take at some future period of the Session a certain course, not only the House of Commons but the Government itself was actually set aside by the officials of the Scotch Office. I venture to say that it was a breach of duty on the part of those officials, and I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman who represents that Office (although I fear he has very little practical acquaintance with it) what has happened to the official who gave this reply? Has he been rebuked for it? Because I think I have never known in the whole course of my acquaintance with public Departments anything more improper on the part of public officials; because it compromises the freedom of the House of Commons, and supercedes Parliamentary action altogether. The truth is that this is only another of the little proofs we receive from time to time of the evil which arises from the fact of the Scotch Minister being in the other House of Parliament. If the Scotch Minister had been in this House he would have known the situation better, and would have been sure that they could not count upon the distribution of the money among local authorities until the Vote had actually passed the Committee of this House. That is a matter by the way, but I think it deserves some attention on account of its importance.

Now come now to the proposals. The Government propose to proceed first by Vote for this year for the purpose of relieving the rates, and hereafter by Bill. Now the question occurs to us at once. Why by Bill? There may be advantages; it may in some respects be necessary to

have a Bill, but it is perfectly evident that there are one or two very serious objections to proceeding to deal by a Bill. In the first place, it destroys, as I understand it, our chance of benefiting by the elasticity of the sum involved. As I understand, Scotland and Ireland are to receive certain grants annually as an equivalent for the sum which is to be expended in England for the abolition of fees. The sum to be expended in England is 10s. per child upon the average attendance, and this sum is calculated upon the statistics of three years ago. These statistics are not stereotyped. The population is increasing, and, even if the population were not increasing, we hope that under the benefits of free education there will be an increase in the attendance, so that there is every chance that a larger sum, if this doctrine of equivalents is to be kept up, will be available year by year. We are accustomed now-a-days, under the influence of our Separatist Chancellor of the Exchequer, to consider with great nicety, and to weigh the balance carefully, between the three Kingdoms, and I really think, if this principle is a proper one, the amount ought to be a moveable sum. The Bill, however, will stereotype it, and it will stereotype not only the sum to be treated under it, but also the objects to which it is to be applied. There may be differences of opinion even on this side of the House with regard to these objects; but I think no one will dispute that there is at least no very fixed opinion in Scotland with regard to the distribution of this money. I have endeavoured, to the best of my power, to gather the opinions of my constituents and others. I gather that there are some things that they do not like, but I have not been able to get much light upon the particular things which they desire. I have said that we have a Separatist Chancellor of the Exchequer, but it is not in that respect that he is peculiar; because we have had these sums dangled before the Scotch people from year to year, and they have been invited to say what they wanted, and what they would spend them upon, when really they had expressed no very definite desire for money of this kind at all. Ordinarily, it would seem that a Finance Minister should consider what

were the financial requirements of the year, fix his taxes to meet those requirements, and then invite the people to bear them; but our Chancellor of the Exchequer lays on the taxes, and then asks the people what they want the money spent upon. Members on both sides of the House will admit that the Scotch people, in regard to the greater part of this money, have no very definite feeling whatever, and therefore it seems to me that it would be undesirable that we should embody this temporary allocation in a Bill; that we should embody in a Bill something which cannot be altered, not only without the difficulty of passing a Bill through the House of Commons, but without the consent of the House of Lords, which body may take a very different view from ours upon Scotch matters. Again, I say, we have a very peculiar Chancellor of the Exchequer. This is not the first occasion, nor even the second or third, upon which expenditure which should be voted by the representatives of the taxpayers has been stereotyped—I do not say in order to deprive, but with the effect of depriving Parliament in future Sessions of having the free disposal of its own money. I will not dwell upon these extraordinary arrangements further; upon this see-saw between the countries—one always having to receive something equivalent to a grant of some sort given to the other the year before—nor upon the sort of Dutch auction in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been engaged. But coming to the purposes to which it is proposed to apply this money, I would say, speaking for myself, I am entirely opposed to giving it to any Body whatever for the mere relief of the rates. I have no objection indeed to assisting from the general taxation local expenditure in a proper way. Local expenditure does bear heavily in many instances, and I have no objection to assistance being given towards definite objects and in a definite proportion, and so as not to invalidate in any way the direct pecuniary responsibility and sense of responsibility on the part of administering bodies. But I can conceive nothing more demoralising or ineffective than the mere

*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*

handing over—flinging—a lump of money to people, saying “Here, if you are short of money you may make it up out of that. We do not care much what particular object this relief shall be applied to. Relieve your rates, make yourselves popular, and leave us alone.” It will be said there is an almost unanimous opinion, from Town Councils especially and Parochial Boards, in favour of getting this money. I do not wonder at it, and I do not blame them for it. If I were a member of a Town Council or a Parochial Board I should be very anxious to make my short reign of office popular by reducing or keeping down the rates. But I have observed a remarkable uniformity and almost identity in the terms of the memorials on the subject, not indicating that voluntary and spontaneous action which one would expect; and I find that, unanimously, the members of these very bodies, which have memorialised in favour of the money being used in relief of rates, are ready to admit in private conversation that they think this state of things is a mistake, and that although they were very glad to get it, and although it would be very useful to them, yet it is bad finance and very likely to have an evil effect in the long run. I am therefore not afraid of having the authority of these public bodies thrown at my head; but I say with regard to the Parochial Boards—the right hon. Gentleman says the Government propose to give £75,000 to the Parochial Boards—there will be a considerable feeling against that so long as the Parochial Boards are unreformed and are not thoroughly representative bodies. I conceive there is much less harm in giving, as is proposed, £25,000 for the definite purpose of relief in respect of Pauper Lunatics. This is free from some of the objections I have been urging; but to give money for the general relief of rates to bodies which do not, as a rule, command the confidence of the people is a course which ought not to be taken, although some of the large Parochial Boards, I admit, are extremely well administered, and not open to any criticism of that sort. But I have another objection with regard to this relief

rates. Not only, as I consider, would it be about the least proper pose to which he could apply this money, but also the relief would be sent to the wrong people. I am not going to enter at this stage into theeties of Scotch rating, but undoubtedly in many cases this relief will go to the pockets of the landlords, and in towns the sensible relief will go to the larger ratepayers, the manufacturers and large shopkeepers, while the relief the working classes will obtain is practically infinitesimal. Each man may pay a halfpenny, or a penny, or twice as his proportion; and when I consider that it is the working-classes that contribute the greater part of the money out of which this is to be paid, I think it furnishes an additional, and perhaps a stronger, argument than those I have already adduced. These are the views I entertain. I am aware that some of my friends may have other views; but I thought it right frankly to state my very strong feeling I have on the subject. Now, what are the other proposals to which the money is to be applied? The right hon. Gentleman will not say anything about commencing the freedom from fees of the primary schools. That, I understand, is not included. I deeply regret that decision of the Government; and my impression is that even those most strongly in favour of obtaining all they can get in relief of rates, and who are perfectly fanatical against secondary education, will admit that the commencing of free primary education was a very first charge upon this money, and I regret that the Government have omitted it. Then I go on to secondary education. Well, I am very pleased to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that the Government are going to give so large a sum of money for this purpose; not so much that it is wanted in the towns or populous places, or in places where there are School Boards, but in a very large area, which can make special arrangements to meet the case; but I have rather in my mind the country districts and sparsely populated districts where we have undoubtedly fallen back. I hope I shall not be held to be at all offensive when

I say that we have fallen down towards the English level. We have lost a great deal of the old superiority we had, when we gave in all the parochial schools higher education to the sons of the people. I am quite sure of this, that no Scotchman will express in this Debate or in any other Debate any jealousy of secondary education. The old theory that continuation schools and opportunities for higher education—scientific, literary, and technical—were peculiarly for the middle-class population, and not for the working classes—that is a theory which never had any footing in Scotland, and, I hope, never will. It is a great benefit to the poorest and humblest man in the community, as it is to the middle-class man, that there should be this opportunity all over the country for superior education, and we have not that opportunity at present. The right hon. Gentleman did not say anything—perhaps he could not say anything—as to how the Government propose to meet the difficulties of the case. That is to be done by ordinances from the Education Department. I am not sure that we are very full of, or overflowing with, faith in the Education Department. But that is a point of detail which may be more properly discussed, perhaps, at another time. I am perfectly aware of the difficulties that may arise from conflicting jurisdictions and other sources; but, at the same time, we will certainly co-operate with the Government in arriving at the best solution of it. Then the last purpose for which the money is to be given is the Universities. Speaking for myself, personally, I am in favour of giving quite as much money as this to the Universities, but I have a strong idea that we do not receive a sufficient amount of money for our Universities compared with the other countries, at present, out of the money annually voted by Parliament, and I should prefer to see this money coming out of a direct Vote on the Civil Service Estimates rather than out of this fund, to which it does not properly belong. At the same time, we must not look at a gift horse in the mouth; and if money is scarce—I should much prefer to take it from other sources myself, but rather than see our Universities go

without the money, I think we may take it from this. But if the Estimates are looked into, I think it will be found that the other parts of the Empire have an advantage over us in respect of money given to the Universities; and I think that it ought to be taken out of the ordinary expenditure for the year. As for the rest of the money, as I have said, the Government give it in relief of rates. For want of any more definite claim on the part of the Scotch people, I should have been content to see it given over to the Town Councils and County Councils, but for definite purposes which could not otherwise be met out of the rates. And, at any rate, I would at least bargain for this: that if the proposal of the Government be adopted, if the money is to be given over to the Town Councils and County Councils, surely they need not be tied down to apply it for the relief of the rates. I think we might at least strike out these words "for the relief of the rates" from the Vote which is on the Table when we come to deal with the definite words, and leave it to the discretion of Town Councils and County Councils. These are the observations which occur to me. I cannot express too strongly my opinion that the whole of these proceedings are slipshod finance, and slipshod administration. That is not our fault. We have to make the best of it. I have said that the proposal to hand over the money for the relief of rates for the present year may be accepted. It may be inevitable in the present state of public opinion, but we should be slow to pledge ourselves, by actual statute, either to any fixed sum, or to objects which we are not certain will satisfy the Scotch people.

\*(5.45.) MR. RONALD C. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith, &c.): I think the majority of the Scotch Members who have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down will agree very heartily with the expressions which he has used in regard to this Bill; and I sincerely hope that this may be the last time we shall be called upon in this House to discuss an equivalent grant. When a generous Government scatters bounty over the land like this we find that the

money is wasted, and we find that the local administration becomes entirely disorganised. Now, with regard to the specific proposals of the Government, I also very much regret that no place has been found amongst them with regard to primary education. So far as secondary education is concerned, I believe that we are not yet provided with a plan which would warrant such large expenditure as is sometimes proposed for that very necessary branch of education, but a large sum may very well be voted for that purpose. Again, with regard to technical education we find no provision whatever made under the proposals of the Government; and so far from making any provision for it, the County Councils are absolutely prohibited from undertaking further work in connection with this case. The County Council with which I am connected myself have shown no disposition to spend this grant in relief of the rates. As it is desirous of carrying on technical education, and as there are quarters in England where the sum of £750,000 has been spent by County Councils in connection with agricultural and other forms of education, I feel that in Scotland we will be placed at a very serious disadvantage if we are to be prohibited from undertaking a work which is doing so much good throughout the whole of the counties of England. The Universities are to be given £30,000, and, knowing as I do the necessity for a grant of that character, I must confess that I do not see my way to oppose it in any form whatever. But, at the same time, I should be very much surprised to find much enthusiasm on behalf of this proposal amongst hon. Members on this side. Our chief knowledge of the Universities on this side is that we find their representatives ranged against us upon every possible occasion, and instead of men of science or men of high culture being sent to represent the Universities here, we find a lawyer or a politician coming to this House in order to pursue Party purposes. I do not think that this is a recommendation which will enable hon. Members on this side of the House to receive the proposals of the Government as well as they might otherwise

*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*

10. At the same time, I think that what has been said, that the University grants should come from the ordinary taxation of the country, is extremely fair; and I think that the money for the Universities ought to have come out of the Treasury in the ordinary form instead of that in which it now appears before the House, The £25,000 which is to go to the relief of the charge for the pauper lunatics should also come under the same head. A statement has been sent round by the Parochial Board which demands that some contribution should be made towards the support of the pauper lunatics. It shows that the rate in Scotland amounts to about 3s. a week, while in England it is fixed at 4s. a week. I think here, again, this is not an occasion for making a demand upon the equivalent grant, but it is an occasion demanding that the Chancellor of the Exchequer shall treat Scotland upon equal terms with England. With regard to the expenditure on medical relief and those other matters, they should more properly come before the Committee on the equalisation of the burdens of local taxation upon different parts of the United Kingdom which is now sitting. I entirely agree with what my right hon. Friend has said in regard to the objects to which it should be obligatory upon the Local Authorities to give the money that should come to them under this grant. I think some good might be done if this money were spent for public libraries, for baths, for the improvement of public parks, and for other necessary purposes, such as technical education, or in the construction of harbours or new works, which are very much required. In Ross-shire the demand for new works and harbours is very great. I think these are matters to which we might perfectly well devote the money which is to come to us under the proposals of the Government. The whole system of these grants I think is entirely unsatisfactory; and as these promiscuous bounties descending upon us lead to a very bad system of administration, I sincerely trust that we see the last occasion upon which this may be done. I think there has been an immense amount of money wasted,

and I think it upsets the whole system of Imperial finance.

\*(5.53.) MR. JAMES SOMERVELL (Ayr, &c.): We have already taken advantage in Scotland of the grants from Imperial taxation to give free education to Scotland, and the only subject that remains now is to see whether we will adopt the English practice and give this grant entirely to the relief of rates, or whether it is in accordance with the feeling of the people of Scotland, to give a portion to improve the education which has been already made free. I think that the remark of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs as regards this amount being stereotyped is a very forcible one. We were told that this sum of £265,000 is more than originally was calculated would come to Scotland, and, as the calculation was wrong in the past, it very probably will be equally wrong in the future, and as education and the number of children must increase in England, so the share to Scotland will be considerably increased, and I hope, in a few years, will amount to £300,000. If that is the case, I think this measure should state the manner of allocation. It is right that a certain sum should be stereotyped. I think it is perfectly right if the Universities are to receive £30,000, that sum should be definitely fixed. I have very great sympathy with the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs upon this Vote. I think it very hard upon Scotland that this £30,000 should be taken out of this money. I think that money should be given altogether out of the general finances of the country. The right hon. Gentleman rather sneered at the members of the local Town Councils and County Councils in effecting economy and reducing the rates. I would remind him that he is the representative of the same electors as have returned these bodies; and that, while it is their duty to diminish the rates as far as they can, the same electors would be very thankful if the right hon. Gentleman, in his place in Parliament, would do his utmost to get a grant by which the rates should be reduced. The right

hon. Gentleman alleged, as regards grants being given to the Parochial Boards, that the Parochial Boards were not elected upon a sufficiently popular basis. I would remind him that it was entirely owing to the action of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that a measure for the establishment of Parochial Councils in Scotland was not carried at the same time as the County and District Councils Act. It is not a question really of throwing money at the heads of the ratepayers of Scotland. This is a question to enable the Scotch ratepayer to get that relief to which he is justly entitled; and which he did not get for two years owing to his desire to have free education for his children first. I must say I should like to have had a more definite view from the Government in regard to the £60,000 which is to be spent upon Secondary Education. I cannot adopt the view that this higher education affects all the children in Scotland. I think that the poorer classes will derive very small benefit indeed from the £30,000 to be given to the Universities, and it will depend entirely upon the manner in which this £60,000 is appropriated whether the children of the working classes will get any benefit from it at all or not. It is impossible for the children of the working classes to attend school beyond a certain age. If they are to earn a living, and, at the same time, to improve their education, they must be apprenticed, or must be learning, from the age of 14 and upwards, the trades which they are going to pursue. It can only be by the means of technical education that they can hope to raise themselves to a higher position than that which they now occupy. I think, therefore, that it would have been a very great advantage if the Government had seen their way to enable a portion of this money to be applied towards technical education. What is wanted in Scotland is not so much more money, but a thorough administration of existing funds. The right hon. Gentleman opposite says the allocation should not be embodied in a Bill. I think it should be. It was done in the case of England, and that course met with general

acceptance. The Government have, in my view, shown wisdom in defining the objects to which this money is to be applied. If the county of Ross, for example, desire that part of the money should go for roads, it can spend it in that way. But, Sir, I think it is altogether opposed to the general local convenience of the county that it should be made a matter of contest every three years how certain money is to be applied. One of the strongest arguments in favour of this measure is that it defines definitely the destination, instead of leaving it to the passing breath of the moment. I think also that the Government were wise in adopting the principle of valuation, and not of assessment. This will contribute to economy. No reason has been shown why this Bill should not be now read a first time, and I trust the negative criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman opposite will not be allowed to retard its progress, but that the points that have been mentioned will be reserved for Committee, where they may be properly discussed, and a Bill advanced by which the people of Scotland will get considerable remissions of local taxation.

\*SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN (*Glasgow, Bridgeton*): I think the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is a little hard in protesting against one of the few opportunities which Scotch Members have of discussing Scotch business, and I do not think the Government will join with him in his protest. In a question of this great importance and complexity, and at the same time so familiar to hon. Members that they have all made up their minds upon it even on this its first presentation to the House, I imagine it will be a much greater assistance than an obstacle if the opinions of the Scotch Members are expressed as clearly as they have been expressed. And it is necessary that those who do not take altogether the same view as those who have already spoken should say something, remembering, at the same time, that we have no right, on the first reading, to speak longer than is necessary to express concurrence or emphatic dissent. Now, Sir, I feel bound to say I never heard a speech in which I more agreed with the conclusions, but in regard to one or two

*Mr. James Somervell*

of the principal arguments with which I ~~ess~~ agree than that of my right hon. Friend the Member for Stirling. Therefore, it is necessary to put in a protest against one or two of those arguments, in order that the Government may not think that there is universal agreement amongst Members on this side. The history of this money, the disposition of which we are discussing, is complicated enough, and goes through various historical stages; but the present position of it is undeniable. It is the same sum of money which was made over to the English ratepayers from the Exchequer, and to do anything else than give it, in one form or another, to the Scotch ratepayers is to lay upon the Scotch ratepayers a special Imperial tax. You may like the distinction, or you may dislike it; you may like to spend money on the University or on secondary education, or you may dislike it; but no less if so spent we levy a differential tax upon the Scotch ratepayer, and against that I briefly but unreservedly protest. I cannot agree with my right hon. Friend that Scotch opinion is anything like unanimous in this matter. The local bodies are, in my opinion, on this question of expenditure the true spokesmen of the country. Hon. Members deny that the Municipal Bodies are fair exponents of the feelings of the boroughs. I think that the principles we hold on this side oblige us to say that those local bodies, in regard to the larger cities at any rate, are strictly representative, and they almost unanimously regard this money as a debt to the Scotch ratepayer. So far as I know, they unanimously regard any other application as frittering away Scotch resources instead of keeping them intact to give sensible relief in the quarter in which relief is due. They are unanimous in thinking that the relief of 2d., 3d., or 4d., even 5d., which has been given to great English cities, would be equally acceptable to Scotch cities, and equally their due. There was a great deputation last year to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The strongest arguments were urged by members of Municipal Bodies and of Parochial Boards. But of what Parochial

Boards? There are many Parochial Boards which contain a really representative element. I know that the representative members of the Parochial Boards are elected under the plural vote, and in so far they are less representative than we would wish to see them; but in the Barony Parish of Glasgow, out of 29, 21 are elected members. As regards the deputations from the Municipal Bodies, there can be no question whatever as to their elective character. The constituents of these bodies—the enormous town populations of these cities—have not found it necessary to take exception to the action of their representatives last year. I do not want to put the matter mainly on the ground of Scotch feeling. I maintain that there are grave reasons of public policy against dribbling out fractions of public money to be applied to special services. Nothing leads to so much waste and gives rise to so much worry among Local Bodies as having a certain sum from the Treasury to put to a certain use, to which, perhaps, they do not want to put it. The importance of the public object, and the wisdom of carrying it out, ought to be considered on its own merits by the local authority. When the Glasgow Municipality set up baths and wash-houses and model lodging-houses they, first of all, considered whether these were advisable matters to be undertaken by a public body. Having considered and determined that, they allotted a sum of money out of the rates. But that is a very different thing from giving a body like the Glasgow Council a certain amount which may only be spent in the superannuation of the Police, on secondary education, or on technical education. My right hon. Friend says he wishes Parliament to have the disposal of its own money. I wish the local Parliaments of our great towns to have the free disposal of their money. If Glasgow or Aberdeen, or Dundee, wish to have secondary education or public parks, or model lodging houses, well, let them say so, but do not give them a sum of money which they may not have unless to spend upon some service which Parliament dictates—money which is indubitably



their own, and which they have a right to spend as they choose. I cannot agree with the hon. Member in thinking that the allotment of money for technical education in the English counties has been altogether a success, but what has made it even the success that it is, is this—that they are not obliged to spend it upon technical education; therefore, if there is not a real machinery for carrying out technical education, they would not spend the money upon it. In what follows I am speaking entirely for my constituency, which is in a different position from the rural districts. I entirely object, and the people in Glasgow entirely object, to regarding secondary education as a proper burden for the ratepayers. There are great endowments already in Glasgow, quite sufficient to give secondary education to the entire city. Already, the poorer ratepayer, the working man, as well as everybody else, pays large sums for keeping up the High School at Glasgow, upon which I am told that there is a debt of £45,000 for building and repairs. Who go to the High School? Not so much the sons of the working men, not even exclusively the sons of professional men and commercial men of Glasgow, but people from a distance, whose education is largely paid for by the poor working man of Glasgow. But that is not all. Glasgow is in a very peculiar position. In Glasgow directly you improve by public money the elementary school, so that it is able to give that sort of education which the right hon. Gentleman described so admirably at the end of his speech, and which is a special characteristic of Scotland—so soon as the school is able to give that education, what does the School Department do? Why, Sir, it separates that school from the rest, and puts it into a special class of fee-paying schools. These schools are not the schools of the ratepayer. He has to pay for the building and maintenance of these schools, but he cannot send his children there. He has to pay his money out of the rates in order to make more of this class of schools, which are to remain select and privileged, and from which his children are to be excluded.

*Sir George Trevelyan*

I have no objection to any amount of bursaries that will enable the children of the elementary schools to get a higher class education, but I do object, in Glasgow especially, to the ordinary working man ratepayer paying for secondary education which he does not share. As regards the Universities, I gather there is unanimity. We all wish the Universities to have more money, but we all wish that it should come from the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury—if he will allow me to refer to his admirable replies to the deputation that waited upon him from Scotland—spoke of Oxford and Cambridge as being very highly endowed. But these are not the only Universities in the South. There are Colleges in Wales, there are Universities in England—some in existence, some in embryo—and if more money is given to the Scotch Universities out of the rates there will be, almost immediately, a demand for more for the South country Universities. Again there will be an equivalent grant to Scotland for which we shall have to find some special destination, and, therefore, we will go on in this vicious circle of special grants for special objects to Local Bodies in Scotland. The remedy is plain. Let the Local Bodies have their own money, and let them dispose of it themselves. We talk of the wisdom of Parliament, but these Local Bodies are wiser still with regard to their own wants. I would not fetter them. I would not tie them down even to the relief of local rates. I would leave the matter to their absolute discretion. I apologise for having spoken so warmly on a subject on which there is so much difference of opinion, and I thank the House for its attention.

\*(6.20.) MR. HOZIER (*Lanarkshire, South*): I tender to the Lord Advocate my warmest congratulations upon the clearness and lucidity of his speech, and upon his proposals generally: though it seems to me that the discussion upon those proposals will come more conveniently when we have the measure before us in print. In the next place, I wish to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down upon a most unwounded

display of backbone. The confident way in which he spoke shows that he has many supporters at his back, and on the present occasion I am one of the most enthusiastic of them. Thirdly, I wish to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs on the comparative moderation of the language with which he now attacks the unfortunate ratepayer in Scotland.

MR. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN : did not attack the ratepayer.

MR. HOZIER : Perhaps not the ratepayer, but at any rate the relief of rates. He said the ratepayer ought to be able to do without any relief whatever. On the 28th July, 1890, the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the naked and brutal relief of rates." That was a little stronger than his language this evening.

MR. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN : I am sorry the hon. Gentleman does not understand the word brutal, which is used in its French, rather than in its English, sense. In its French sense it means "simple."

MR. HOZIER : I think that on the whole, Sir, a Scottish Member in the British Parliament ought to speak in English rather than in inferior French. The naked and brutal relief of rates, indeed! It is a "nakedness" of which our Government need be ashamed, and "brutality" for which the people of Scotland may well be deeply grateful. Now, Sir, we hear two voices from the Front Opposition bench. Is it possible that there are going to be dissident Gladstonians in the future? Does the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs act as the spokesman of his Party when he says that deficits are better than surpluses? He said every Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to be very careful not to have a surplus at the end of a year. Sir, as a County Member, there is one portion of his Bill on which I look with some anxiety—namely, that portion allotting £60,000 for technical education. It is difficult to see how the rural districts will derive much benefit unless, indeed, there are to be lecturers who will go about from place to place. I understand that technical education is not to be included in secondary

education. If that is so, I must say that I am very sorry indeed. The hon. Member for Leith (Mr. Munro Ferguson) earnestly hopes that no further sums of money will be granted to Scotland. Of course, that merely means that he earnestly hopes that his Party may come into power, for, with the Gladstonian Party in power, there is not the slightest chance of there ever being any surplus.

(6.28.) MR. D. CRAWFORD (Lanarkshire, N.E.) : I shall not adopt the controversial tone of the hon. Gentleman opposite, and, as I come after him, I shall escape the lash of his criticism. Sir, as regards this very important Bill, I believe that £265,000 wisely husbanded and wisely expended will do a great deal of good, and make many improvements that are much required. I do not follow the example of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury in making comparisons between measures of relief and other measures relating to Ireland. I confess I listened with astonishment to that comparison. Sir, I desire to mention one or two points to which the Government may give consideration. These points mainly refer to the £60,000 for technical education. But on the point of rating I should say that I am more in agreement with the Member for the Stirling Burghs than the Member for Bridgeton. I am not astonished that the Government has gone some way in the relief of rates. I agree there has been no strong demand from other quarters in regard to the disposition of this money. It does not carry us any length to say the Parochial Boards are not unanimous in asking for this money, and then the right hon. Gentleman said that it was not desirable to give the money to Local Bodies and to tell them to apply it for certain purposes which they did not ask the money for. I agree with my right hon. Friend when he said that the money should be given to these Local Bodies with a large discretion as to the use of it. But that is not the proposal of the Bill. It would be very easy to make the proposal still more advantageous and workable by this addition to it; the Local Bodies should have the power of accumulating this

grant. They ought not to be obliged to spend it, and, it may be, waste it year after year. I know the Town Councils have come to the consideration of how this money is to be spent with a good deal of anxiety. Why should they be obliged to spend the money all in one year? If they are allowed to save it up and make it the foundation of a common-good fund, such as many of the towns of Scotland used to have, that money would be a most valuable nest-egg to the County Council. I earnestly ask the Government to consider this point—that in addition to giving the Local Bodies discretion as to the use they are to put the money to, they should also have the power of accumulation. With regard to the sum that is proposed to be devoted to secondary education, so far as my information goes, I think it is too small. I should say that not less than £75,000 would be necessary for the purpose. The proposal to split up the educational endowments is an entire impossibility. These endowments must remain localised. The question is—and it is an all-important question—how is this money, which it is proposed to devote to secondary education, to be administered? The Government proposed that it should be administered by the Education Department. Let them remember that this is local money, and it is so called even under the title of the Bill. It, therefore, ought not to be administered by any central department whatever. I look with the greatest anxiety and jealousy on the proposal if it is really persevered in by the Government. I am aware that the Scottish Education Department is not only faithfully, but most zealously and ably, administered at the present moment, but that is no reason for placing in its hands what I might describe as an unconstitutional discretion in the disposal of public money. There is no precedent to be found for it in the large sums that passed through the hands of the Education Department under the Act of 1872, because the money goes out almost automatically and according to rules, so that it was impossible to favour one school more than another. But by the

present proposal it would be the duty of the Department to pick and choose here and there what part of Scotland was to get the dole out of this education money. And why should this expedient be resorted to when we have a much better one at hand? and that is that the distribution of the money should be by the counties. The proper authority to administer the money is the County Council. It is local money, and ought to be locally administered, and in the manner which the Local Authorities thought the best. Speaking generally, the County Councillors are, for the most part, the pick of the School Boards, and are therefore perfectly competent to form a sensible plan to meet the educational needs of their own county. Let the Government look to the precedent of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889, under which it is the duty of the County Council to form an educational scheme for the wants of the community. I think this money ought to be available both for intermediate education as well as secondary education.

\*(6.40.) Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): I congratulate my right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate on the clearness of his statement in introducing the Bill. I join the hon. Member opposite in expressing satisfaction that the claims of secondary education are recognised by the Government in the measure. On this subject, however, as to the application of the money, one must reserve his opinion until the details of the scheme are made known to the House. I am not prepared to say that the Scottish Education Department is not a very fit source from which the scheme should emanate, but a great deal will depend on how the money is to be applied, and we have no information from the Lord Advocate to enable us to give a decided opinion on the subject in its details. I am sorry to find my hon. Friend the Member for South Lanarkshire not quite clear as to the principle of applying part of this money for the promotion of secondary education. In Scotland we have always considered secondary education to be mixed up with primary education, so that they could not very

*Mr. D. Crawford*

all be entirely separated; and if we had that primary education is a fit subject to receive money which might be said to be claimable by the rate-payers, we may in the same way claim the same character for secondary education. I am sure there will be no dissatisfaction in Scotland with this application of a portion of the money, provided the scheme for its distribution is a fair and reasonable one. It is of importance that this should be done. Our educational measures of late years have rather thrown secondary education into the background. It has been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bridgeton that the working man has not the same interest in secondary schools as his neighbours who are better off. It is in the speech of the right hon. gentleman who was Lord Advocate last year, we had an assurance from the Government that they would consider the importance of having facilities for deserving youths who are not themselves in a position to obtain admission to secondary schools, finding entrance to them as bursars. That is a principle which has been largely followed in many parts of Scotland, and I hope the Government will provide the same facilities for extending the system. On the subject of assistance to the Universities, I have to acknowledge with satisfaction that our aims have been very fairly met by the Government, I will say so, however, that no grant given in this way to the Universities must be looked upon as a closing of the account, or as if we are thereby to lease the claim which the Universities have, as national institutions, to any support from Government which is wholly necessary for their maintenance and prosperity. But the Act of Parliament passed a year or two ago for the Universities has exposed them to great additional expenses, and without some such assistance as it is proposed to give them in this Bill it will be almost impossible to put in practical application the Act of 1889. I believe that what is proposed to give them now will go a great way towards making it possible to apply that Act in such a manner as to benefit the Universities as the country would

desire. After all, the sum to be given if divided equally among the four Universities, will only amount to £7,500 each. That is not so large an amount as to lead us to suppose that there will be no more need for private benefactions to extend these institutions, to found new Chairs, and so on; but it will go a great way towards making it possible to put them in thoroughly good working order under the new constitution which this House has recently given them. The hon. Member for Leith (Mr. Munro Ferguson), while not wishing to say anything against the Universities, objected to this part of the Government proposals, because their Parliamentary representation is not entirely to his mind. In reply, I may say this: that this money is not for the Parliamentary representatives, nor for the graduates who elect them, but to enable the Universities to do better work as teaching institutions; and the hon. Member may console himself with the thought that if the Universities do their work with greater efficiency, they will in the future turn out better graduates—men who will possibly exercise a better judgment in the selection of their Parliamentary Representatives.

(6.48.) DR. CLARK (Caithness): I look upon this question from another standpoint than that of the hon. Members who have spoken; and I do not know that it is necessary for me to move an Amendment, but I intend to vote against the First Reading of this Bill, and to oppose it from its first stage till its last. I am very strongly opposed to this dying Parliament, which does not represent the feeling of Scotland to-day—trying to tie the hands of future Parliaments in reference to this matter. I am astonished at my right hon. Friend the Member for Bridgeton looking at England and Scotland from the same standpoint. Of this grant of £175,000, £75,000 is to go to the Parochial Boards. Well, one-half of that will be a present to the landlords, because, as my right hon. Friend is aware, in Scotland one-half of the rate is levied upon and paid by the landlord, and the other half by the occupier. So that as regards one-half, or £37,500, there is no doubt at all that it will go to the relief of the landlords. Then

another share is to go for the relief of rates in the counties in burghs; and assuming that only 15 per cent. goes to the relief of the landlords, that at once gives £15,000 that will go to the landlords.

An hon. MEMBER: They will get 22 per cent.

DR. CLARK: Well, I will take it at 15 per cent. only; I want to be moderate. Well, then, at least £50,000 will thus at once go into the pockets of the landlords; and those who have bought estates with certain burdens on them will immediately have the value of their property increased by the proposed application of this grant. That is for the present year; but ultimately the whole will go into the pockets of the landlords, so that we are by this Bill simply voting a subvention of £175,000 to the Scotch landlords. I, for one, am strongly opposed to that; I, for one, want to secure the very opposite. In the past, landlords have been turning all the burdens they took upon themselves on to the shoulders of the tenants, and I want to turn back those burdens upon the landlords. I therefore hope that when this Parliament, which was elected upon false pretences, goes back to the constituencies, the new Parliament will consist of men of a different type altogether—men who will be animated by new ideas. The proposed method of distributing this grant simply means the taxing of industry for the benefit of the landlords. The workers of Scotland are the people who contribute four-fifths of this money; yet not one-fifth of it will go back into their pockets. Here, again, you are trying to rob the workers for the benefit of this privileged class of landlords. I do not object to the contribution to be given towards secondary and technical education, but the £30,000 to the Universities I do object to on historical grounds. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer three years ago brought in a Bill by which he proposed, by giving £46,000 to the Scotch Universities, to free this Parliament from the pledge given at the Union to maintain the Scotch Universities, I opposed that proposal. I think the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) is scarcely accurate in what he said as to Scotland

getting more than England for University purposes. The English Universities were endowed by Governments and Parliaments. The Scotch Universities were not so endowed. They came under the control of the bodies constituting them, and they got annual votes for their maintenance, which is a wider and better system than that of England, a system by which Parliament has been able to retain control of the Universities. Then, when we united with England, this was one of the burdens which was to be taken over by the united Parliament. We had the privilege of taking upon us our share of the English burdens, not one of which has been lightened for us; but England, to its eternal disgrace, has been lightening her burdens so far as Scotland is concerned. Where she does carry out her bargain she gives a miserable thousand pounds, say, to the National Gallery. In every way I hold that Scotland has been badly treated by England, just as in this case the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by giving £46,000 to the Universities, sought to relieve Parliament of the promise to maintain the Scottish Universities. I opposed that proposal persistently, and until the Chairman of Committees refused to take any more Amendments from me. I say you have taken upon yourselves the burden of the Scotch Universities. We have taken the burden of your National Debt and other burdens; and you must carry out your part of the agreement as we have done ours, and I will tease this House in the future, as I have done in the past, until I can get for Scotland financial fair play. On these grounds I oppose this Bill; but I admit that what you may have a right to do is to give your gift to the landlords for this year. You, however, want to pass a Bill that would tie the hands of what may be a much more Democratic House of Commons through the action of the House of Lords. Well, I do not care if you do bring in the House of Lords. We are going to fight the House of Lords; but I think the only true and honest course for Members who think as I do is to vote against this Bill in all its stages. I am opposed to its principle. You may apply it in this way

*Dr. Clark*

: England. The English Members have frittered away this money and we lost it; but we, the Scotch Members, refuse to do so. Our position with reference to rating has always been different from that of the English Members. I am willing at this money, which we must have our equivalent grant, should be sent for any purpose for which there at present no rating power. If you use it for a purpose for which you have ready a rating power, then you are rowing away the money. If my hon. friend the Member for North Aberdeen (Mr. Hunter) brings in a scheme for pensions in Scotland, and allows us to settle the pension question in Scotland we did Free Education, then I could support the use of this money entirely for that purpose, although I agree that, to a certain extent, it would be of relief of the rates in the end. It is as far as I am concerned, my objection is to oppose this Bill in any shape or form. The only thing you have a right to do is to settle the question for the present year, but not tie our hands in the next Parliament.

(9.55.) MR. MARK STEWART (Inverclyde): The hon. Member for North Ayrshire (Dr. Clark) has avowed a policy which I cannot think will be very acceptable to his own constituents; and I shall be curious to see how many Scotch Members will follow him into the Lobby if he carries out his intention to divide the House. He seems to think that this Bill is thrown out as a sop to the landed interest.

DR. CLARK: Hear, hear.

MR. MARK STEWART: Well, I think not. I would point out, in the first place, that in his county the ratepayers pay two-thirds of the taxes and the proprietors one-third. I believe that the opposite to that is the case in the burghs. But then, again, we find that the proprietors pay the county rate, and they have hitherto paid large portions of the cost of the formation of new roads and bridges, and still do so. They also pay half of the road rate and half of the poor rate. But there are other rates which fall exclusively on the shoulders of the proprietors, such as those under the

Cattle Diseases Acts and other matters which it is not necessary for me to go into at this moment. To say that £100,000, to be given in relief of local rates levied by the Councils is a sop to the landlords, therefore, is not at all the case, and is very far from being in any way accurate. The way in which the Government propose to allocate this £100,000 will, I maintain, be found to be most equitable to the country at large. We had a large meeting some weeks ago in Scotland of various bodies interested in this matter, and they came to the conclusion that a large proportion—a half—of this grant should go for the relief of the rates, leaving the application to particular rates to the discretion of the different Local Authorities. It was not, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs had said, to be stereotyped; but it was to be left entirely to the discretion of those who levied the rates to decide how the grant was to be applied. Well, now, the Bill has met with general acceptance in this House, but there are many questions which must come up for further discussion, and one of them will relate to the £60,000 to be given for secondary education. It is a most important provision of the Bill, but one which it will be difficult to carry into practice. I suppose in country districts it will be used to provide more teaching power in the schools. It is all very well to put in another master; but although sometimes there will be many farmers' sons anxious to reap the benefit of secondary education, at others there will be very few to attend a class. Any clause on this subject ought to be an enacting clause, appropriating a certain sum for secondary education each year. While I have always been a friend of technical education, I must honestly say that my view is not shared in my part of the country. I should like to know whether the Local Authority would be permitted to use any part of the grant out of the £40,000 for building as well as for teaching purposes? I believe the allocation made by the Government generally will meet with the approval of the whole country, and satisfy the people of Scotland, whether Liberals or Tories, University or otherwise, and I



axes on the Budget. The right hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs has taken a departure from general Liberal principles on this occasion. I should regret the money going into the pockets of the landlords; but I think in the municipalities five-sixths of this amount would go direct into the pockets of the ratepayers, and only one-sixth into the pocket of the landlord. It may be different in rural districts, but representing an urban constituency including a respectable working class, I feel satisfied that not 10 per cent. of them would be favourable to this money being devoted to any other purpose than the reduction of the rates. I trust the Government will re-consider their proposals, and act upon the representations made to them by the strong deputation which waited on the First Lord of the Treasury and the Lord Advocate in reference to this matter.

(7.25.) MR. A. BIRRELL (Fife, W.): When the Members for Glasgow do agree their unanimity is wonderful. They seem to be disturbing the House by introducing into it a new party, and I am not surprised that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not been in his place during any part of the evening to witness what is the somewhat degrading spectacle of the Representatives of Scotland meeting together to discuss, not the question of what taxation may be necessary or useful, but how certain swag should be disposed of. I can see no reason in the speech of the Lord Advocate to justify his arbitrary division of this fund, and I am sure he will not say he has acted upon any profound or certain calculation, or gone upon anything but the rule of thumb. It is much too soon to proceed by Bill in this matter. There is one omission in it which all Parties regret, and that is that an opportunity has not been taken for absolutely freeing primary education. With reference to the £60,000 for intermediate education, the Lord Advocate might have plucked up courage to extend the amount to £75,000. I regret the introduction of this Bill, and I feel sure, if it is proceeded with, as no doubt it will be, it will only increase the discontent of the Scotch with the way in which their business

is transacted in this House, and their wishes overruled by an English majority.

(7.29.) MR. MARJORIBANKS (Berwickshire): I do not wish to go into the details of this scheme, but I do wish to place on record the fact that I object to the scheme altogether. I maintain that the Government are going to rob Scotland in this matter, and not to obtain any great national advantage. Here you have a great sum of £260,000 a year, and how are you going to use it? Simply to try to blind as many different classes in Scotland as you possibly can. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to deal with a great national matter like this. Windfalls of £265,000 a year do not come to Scotland every day, and therefore, I say, this sum ought either to have been used for some great scheme of national education, some great scheme, like that of the hon. Member for Aberdeen, of national pensions for Scotland, or some other scheme for the benefit of the whole people of Scotland. Several references have been made as to how the different classes of the community would benefit from using this money in relief of the rates if the Government scheme were adopted. Calculation has been made, I think, with regard to Edinburgh, in which it all came out in a very clear manner. The Treasurer of that city calculated that he would have £33,000 to deal with this year—that is for the coming year and the current half-year, and on that he calculated that he would be able to reduce the rates by 3d. in the £. What benefit would that confer on the ratepayers? Forty per cent. would have 2s. 6d. each in their pockets; 28 per cent. would have their burdens lightened by sums varying from 2s. 6d. to 5s.; 19 per cent. would have sums varying from 5s. to 12s. 6d.; and 13 per cent. would absorb in varying proportions more than one-half of the entire grant. That is to say that 13 per cent. of the population, and they the richest and best able to bear rates, would receive the greatest relief. It seems to me, Sir, that that calculation absolutely condemns the proposal of the Government.

(7.35.) MR. J. P. SMITH (Lanark, Partick): There is one point in regard



to this fund on which we shall all agree: it ought not to be stereotyped. The Bill fixes it at £265,000, being a certain proportion to the amount granted to England. Now, if there is one thing more certain than another, it is that the charge for free education in England will increase, and we should take care that Scotland has her fair share of that increase.

SIR CHARLES PEARSON: The amount will fluctuate each year according to the fluctuation of the corresponding amount for England.

MR. J. P. SMITH: That will remove and explain some difficulties. It seems to me that inside the division made by the Government between the claims of rates and education there will be other divisions—between Municipal and County Councils and Local Boards, in respect to the amount to be devoted to the local rates. There will be a great disappointment among these bodies at the fact that in future years they will receive less than in the present year. The Lord Advocate did not say who were to be the residuary legatees of this fund, and obtain anything which is over the exact figures he specified.

SIR CHARLES PEARSON: That would go to increase the £175,000 in relief of local rates.

MR. J. P. SMITH: That ought to go a good way in satisfying the Town and County Councils. It is the Municipal and County Council rates which need relief more than those imposed by Parochial Boards; the latter in respect to the general poor rate are diminishing positively and more rapidly as valuation increases. It is proposed to distribute this money according to valuation; but the result will be that the rates in counties will be diminished three times as much as in the boroughs. The assessment in counties is almost three times as great as in the towns, and the population in the towns is nearly three times as great as that in the counties. In regard to the money devoted to education a question will arise between Universities and Schools. I do not say anything against the claims of the Universities to £20,000, yet as they are, to a large extent, national institutions, a share of that money should come from the general fund of the country, and not from

that specially for Scotland. I cannot agree with the hon. right Member for Bridgeton in his attack on the Elective Bodies who had been dealing with the schools and making the best of them fee schools. I have been round looking in England and Scotland at the best schools I could find, and I must say that the equipment of the school I saw at Govan was better than any of those I saw. The hon. Member for South Lanarkshire said that this scheme would be of no use to the country. It is of the utmost importance that in any scheme of secondary education special care should be taken to make it apply to rural districts as well as to the towns. I think it might be done by developing the higher branches of study in the schools. I feel that to some extent we ought to have local work in the administration of this money, something corresponding to the case of Welsh Intermediate Education, though I agree with the control being to a great extent in the hands of the Scotch Education Department. In a general way it seems to me that the Government may be very well satisfied with the reception accorded to their scheme. It has been a very difficult task indeed to satisfy all the claims on this fund; but it will be a great blessing to hon. Members living in Scotland to have an Act passed which will save us from the continual and inconsistent claimants from all sides.

(7.40.) MR. J. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I was inclined, when the Lord Advocate introduced the Bill to congratulate him on inaugurating his representation of the Government in Scotch affairs by introducing a Bill which would give a large gift of money to Scotland. But since I have listened to the debate and seen how much diversity of opinion exists among Scotch Members, how much work there is before us before we get rid of the allocation of the money, I am not sure that I can make that congratulation. There is something very peculiar in the way in which the question comes before us. As a rule Bills of this kind would be framed with a view of providing for an object which everybody desired, and that we should go to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and ask him to provide the money. But here

*Mr. J. P. Smith*

we reverse the order. We, having a sum of money thrown at our heads which has not been disposed of, have to find some way of disposing of it. This is a grant in aid of local taxation which has never been asked for by Scotland. It will be recollected that the question was brought up by English County Members on account of the undue pressure of the rates upon them, and they called on the Government to relieve the pressure. In those debates I do not think there was any indication of a similar demand on the part of the Scotch Members. However, something has been done to relieve the rates in England, and an equivalent is given to Scotland. I believe I may say with some confidence that there does not exist among the people of Scotland a desire for a relief of the rates—at any rate it does not exist outside of Glasgow. The Town Council of the city I represent is in favour of the proposal, and the Parochial Boards will be glad to get the money, but I do not believe that they represent the opinion of the mass of the people of Scotland. If we were to take a *plébiscite* of the boroughs of Scotland as to the disposition of the money, we should have an overwhelming majority against expending it in relief of rates. I believe the reason of that is that the relief would not be to the majority of the ratepayers, but to a minority, because it would go to the pockets of the wealthier class. This money would have furnished an opportunity for conferring some great and permanent benefit on Scotland. It is a serious incidental evil in this case that the relief which appears to be given to the ratepayers by the grant from the central Exchequer will not be found, in the long run, a standing benefit to them, because it is generally found that instead of producing a diminished charge on the ratepayers it only produces a somewhat larger expenditure, and therefore I do not believe that the benefit to be derived from the grant to Parochial Boards, for instance, will be so great as the Government appear to expect; it will be felt only to the extent of 50 or 60 per cent. of the whole grant. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the great difference of opinion which has been shown to-night among Scotch Members

as regards the distribution of the money furnishes an extremely effective argument against disposing of the money once for all by the scheme of the Government Bill. When we see all these differences between the Scotch Members with regard to the rates as between town and country, and with regard to the Universities and secondary education, there is surely a very strong case for not proceeding rashly and wholly in this matter; for giving the people of Scotland and their Representatives here opportunity to consider the matter in future years, and to see how the experiment works we are asked to try is succeeding, and to take the true constitutional view in money questions; of having an opportunity in each Session of considering the matter, and, if necessary, taking away some of the money from appropriations where it is not doing well, and giving it to some other purpose. When we come to the Second Reading I hope the Government will see the force of the argument used at the beginning of the Debate, and say that this shall only be done by Bill for one year. On the question of secondary education we hope also to have, not a suggestion that this sum of £60,000 should be applied according to the goodwill of the Scotch Education Department in pursuance of Minutes framed by that Department, but a real scheme for the reform and extension of secondary education. We have not heard from the Lord Advocate the intentions of the Government in the matter of secondary education, and we ask that some inquiry shall be held on the matter, or the mind of Scotland consulted during the Recess. There has been some discussion amongst the teachers, but the view of Scotland, as a whole, has not been troubled on the question, and we are asked to vote this money without any idea as to how the Scotch Education Department may deal with it. I agree that there is now a great opportunity to re-develop secondary education, which is the weak point in our Scotch education. We feel that this sum of £60,000 should be taken to put secondary education on its feet. One hon. Member referred to the fact that, though we have large educational en-

dowments in Scotland, they are so tied up by local restrictions that we cannot dispose of them in places where they are most needed. The example of Wales is very much in point. The Endowed School Commissioners have re-distributed school endowments, and have met with much opposition, but if you give power over the local endowments to Local Authorities that experience does not occur. Proposals for the re-distribution of endowments which would not be listened to if they came from the Charity Commissioners have been accepted and carried through, with little friction, when they came from the County Council. I think the same would be the case in Scotland if we created County Authorities to deal with the question of secondary education. I believe you would be acting entirely in accord with Scotch opinion if you were to endeavour to create a Scotch Local Authority to deal with the matter. If we let this £60,000 now slip through our fingers and give it away as some piece of patronage, to be disposed of by the Scotch Education Department, we lose the chance of establishing a truly national system of secondary education, and that is another reason why I hope the Bill will not be accepted as a final settlement of the question, but that the House will insist on retaining in its hands the control of this fund, and will insist on revising its application in the light of the experience of a year or two.

(7.55.) MR. C. S. PARKER (Perth): I quite agree that where money is asked for it is easy to appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into the matter. But the situation is at once altered when there is money at the back of the Government recommendations. I regret that there should be the least appearance of endeavouring to settle finally a question which is hardly ripe yet, and which would be the better for more consideration. I think, on the First Reading, we should look at the broad question, how it is that we are dealing in this unusual way with the money. My experience of the House goes back further than that of the hon. Member for Aberdeen, and I cannot agree that there has at no time been a demand in Scotland for relief from the growing

local burdens. No doubt, their pressure is felt more in England, because they fall in the first instance on the occupier, while in Scotland they are divided between occupier and owner. But I remember the time when I stood almost alone, as a Liberal County Member, in this House in voting against proposals to relieve local burdens at the expense of the Exchequer. Strong pressure was put upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the old House of Commons to relieve the local rates. I think the present situation has arisen largely out of the difference between England and Scotland. There was not the strong demand in Scotland for relief of the local rates, and when money was coming to us the ratepayers were open to receive proposals for freeing education, and there was almost unanimity in their desire to have the money applied in that way. I ask the right hon. Member for Bridgeton whether the expressions with regard to applying the money were equally strong in his mind in former years when the question arose as to free education? Because precisely the same argument applies. I believe there is in Scotland to-day a strong desire that this money should go, not to relieve the rates, but for the relief of free education, which is in all countries largely helped either by the Municipalities or by the Government. And the organisations that should go along with it might, if we had time to consider it, be fully elaborated; but this is a Bill containing so many other matters, and devoted so largely to the relief of rates, one can hardly expect that the time of Parliament can be devoted to it. But I am glad to say that we have had it very clearly defined, and we also had it from the First Lord of the Treasury when he yesterday, answering a deputation that waited upon him, intimated that a considerable part of the money would go to secondary education, and be spread over the country at large in order to restore the old state of things in schools, in which most boys were able, near their own homes, to obtain assistance for higher education. Some of the money proposed to be devoted would strengthen the staff in a large number of smaller parish schools, and with that staff so strengthened, I believe

*Mr. J. Bryce*

you might accomplish the objects of elementary education, and give a better education to pupil teachers and carry on continuation schools in the evening. You will have two trained masters instead of one, and you will also have pupil teachers very much better, while in addition you would have what an hon. Member asked for upon the other side, a fusion of schools better conducted in the country, because a staff of two masters would be very much better able to give instruction than one. On the other hand, there is a very difficult question, and one which should not be altogether left to the Education Department—to determine how the money for secondary education should be distributed. I am inclined to think that the best way would be to have recourse to the County Councils to say where these schools should be established. It is familiar to many Members that the endowments of Scotland, where they exist, cannot be counted upon, as the funds throughout Scotland are strictly localised. Public opinion would not tolerate them being taken away. I think County Councils should have charge of the new funds in order that they may work together, in order to set up a system of secondary education throughout Scotland. My own feeling is that the Government, in the difficult situation, has not been altogether unwise. I do not for a moment impute Party motives, but to take neither of the extreme views, that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs nor that of the right hon. Member for Bridgeton. I think that in the small relief given to this country there should have been a larger portion devoted to education; but at all events, seeing the pressure that has been in force, I think it is not a matter of surprise that they should have come to a compromise, and have divided the money.

\*(8.40.) DR. CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, College): This Bill has been spoken of by hon. Members who have addressed the House on the subject as a boon to Scotland. I do not regard it as a boon to Scotland in any respect. According to hypothesis, the amount of taxation which Scotland has contributed towards Imperial funds, to-

wards that portion of the funds out of which the proposed grant is given, is £265,000, plus the expenses of collecting and distributing that money; and what does she get back? We are to get £265,000 more, and the cost of collecting and distributing are to be defrayed in the process; therefore, Scotland is by so much the poorer. But of the £265,000 which has been raised in Scotland by taxation, the poorer classes, who paid about half the Imperial taxation, have paid £137,500, and the richer classes £137,500. But the burden of local taxation falls differently upon the community. The richer classes pay at least three-fourths of the local burden, and the poorer classes not one-fourth. Now, I know that the hon. Member for Aberdeen will put the difference much higher, but I am well within the mark when I say that the richer classes pay at least three-fourths of the local taxation and the poorer classes not one-fourth. What is the position in which the poorer ratepayer will find himself under this Bill? He has, as I have said, contributed £137,500; and out of that he receives back, in the shape of remission of rates, one-fourth, or, say, £44,000. And what is the benefit he gets from secondary education? Now, I doubt whether the poorer classes will reap a benefit out of the £60,000 grant for secondary education to the extent of £10,000. But I am willing, for the sake of argument, to admit that they will derive a benefit of about one-third of the grant, or, say, £20,000; that will make £64,000—the reduction of rates, £44,000, and secondary education, £20,000, or £64,000 in all—which the poor ratepayer will receive in the shape of this boon for the payment of which he had himself contributed £137,500. In other words, he will find himself minus £73,500 through the operation of the boon. What will be the position of the richer classes of the community? If they pay about three-fourths of the rates, they will receive a sum in relief of the rates of £129,000, and that is the total that all of them will get who have not got sons and daughters whom they wish to give secondary education to, or send to the Universities. That is all they

will get, and they will find themselves a good many thousand pounds short. I entirely disagree with the principle of these Grants in Aid, and entirely dissent from the statement that this is a boon. There can be no more vicious system than the system of giving grants from the Imperial Exchequer in relief of local taxation; and one of my objects in desiring to see this Bill passed in a shape as analogous as possible to that passed several years ago in the case of England is that it may put an end to this see-saw, and set aside once and for ever this system of resorting to Grants in Aid. As regards secondary education, I have always considered that the duty of the State is entirely different from its duty in the matter of primary education. Where primary education is compulsory, I have always inclined to the principle that it should be free. If the State thought fit to enact that education should be compulsory, it did so, I take it, on the ground that an uneducated man, so far as the three R's are concerned, was a dangerous member of society, and it decided that he should receive a primary education for the purpose of putting him on an equal footing with the general population, and that being so, it appears to me clearly to be the duty of the State to provide for him, without cost to him, the education that was forced upon him. But the State does not appear to me to owe any such duty in the case of secondary education. That is a luxury. I should like to know what secondary education is, for there appears to me to be the greatest fog hanging over the House to-night as to what is secondary education. The Lord Advocate, when asked whether secondary education included technical education, said he could not say. The whole thing has been left over to a Minute of the Education Department. My hon. Friend the Member for Perth said that one-half of the grant to be given for secondary education should be devoted to doubling the teaching staffs in country schools. Is that secondary education? Why, I should have thought it was strengthening primary education. Certainly, if it would

be called secondary education in the counties, it should be called primary education in the towns. Now, I ask, what is secondary education? Does it mean Latin and Greek? ["No."] Well, then, what does it mean? If it mean Latin and Greek, I entirely object to the public money being spent upon teaching Latin and Greek free of cost, for it appears to me that we have too much Latin and Greek already; it appears to me that that is especially true at a time when we find the greatest Greek scholars in the Universities proposing that Greek as a compulsory subject should be altogether done away with. We have been told that the traditions of Scotland are different from those of England, and that secondary education is no longer on the same footing as in olden times. Why is it not? If Latin and Greek, French and German, mathematics, light and heat, electricity, &c., constitute secondary education, as I think they must be held to do, provision is already made for teaching them in the ordinary public school curriculum. I have the Report of the School Boards of Scotland in my hand, and I find that a very large number of children were presented on such subjects. It appears to me that if you wish to teach them more than the most wretched smattering of education, what you have got to do is to improve your Code. What is wrong with the Code provisions for secondary education is that the grants are so distributed as to tempt boys to pass through a standard in which they learn something by a little easy cramming without giving them any useful knowledge of the subjects that are taught. Before the passing of the Primary Education Act, and for a considerable time afterwards, there was a very large number of educational endowments in Scotland available for the purposes of primary education. And after the Education Act had been passed, before the fees had been done away with, and when the expenses of education had been largely thrown upon the rates, a Commission was appointed, and it was enacted that endowments for the payment of fees and primary education were not to be applied to the relief of the ratepayer,

*Dr. Charles Cameron*

but that they should be made available for the purpose of secondary education. These endowments for the purposes of primary education, for the payment of fees at the time they were exigible, were appropriated for the purposes of secondary education; the result is that in Scotland there is a sum of £191,000 available for that purpose, and that does not include the sum of £23,000 belonging to the City of Glasgow, and which would raise the figure to over £214,000. In many parts of Scotland there may be a want of secondary education in the counties, and certainly I do not desire that the counties should not have their wishes gratified in that respect; but there is no want in the large towns. In Glasgow they have more money than they know what to do with; in Edinburgh they are still better provided for; and I am told that in Aberdeen it is the same thing. ("No.") I do not hold that the hon. Member for Aberdeen can be held to represent the views of his constituents in this matter. But at all events the members of the Glasgow Town Council, and it is stated the Parochial Boards of Glasgow, are all united in giving expression to this view; and at the deputation to the First Lord of the Treasury the other day one of the speakers was the Lord Provost of Aberdeen, and that gentleman said that notwithstanding the valuable services rendered by the hon. Member and his hon. Colleagues in urging upon the inhabitants of Aberdeen the claims of secondary education, notwithstanding that a Municipal Election had taken place, the Town Councillors were unanimous in favour of this fund being allocated not to secondary education, or not even in part to secondary education, but entirely to the relief of the Municipal and County Council rates. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling said, and said truly, that there was no demand from the Scotch ratepayers, or the Scotch rating authorities for grants in aid for Scotland; and he was perfectly right. But, of course, if you go and dangle a sum of nearly a quarter of a million before the eyes of a nation, you cannot expect but that there would be some claimants for the money. Why, in the language

of the most popular lyrical poet of the day,

"If you want to move the lot,  
Put a penny in the slot."

And certainly, when the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer put his penny in the slot, he succeeded in arousing any number of claimants. One Gentleman wishes it in order to have improvements in fisheries carried out; another wishes it for piers and harbours; another for old age pensions. The secondary educationists have considerable organisation, and they, of course, make their claim; and the Universities make their claim. Although I would rather see the money restored to the source from which it came, the practical question is, what are we to do with it? The ratepayer has been regarded by some person as *hostis humani generis*. I entirely dissent from this view of the ratepayer. He bears certain burdens of the State, and the next best thing to putting that money back into the pockets from which you took it is to give it to the ratepayers. That is preferable to anything else I have heard proposed. I am glad the right hon. Gentleman the Lord Advocate has indicated that the sum dealt with in the Bill is not a fixed sum, but that it will be capable of being expanded in the proportion in which the English grant is expanded. The explanation of the Lord Advocate on that point is perfectly satisfactory. As to the suggestion of the Member for North-East Lanark (Mr. Donald Crawford) to the effect that County Councils should have power to accumulate the grant and make it into a Common Good that I would strongly deprecate. So far as the towns are concerned the Common Good is a fund out of which everything that will not bear criticism by the ratepayers is paid. In Glasgow, when there was starvation existing, a deputation waited on the Corporation and asked for employment to be provided and paid for out of the Common Good. They were told "No, that was quite impossible; that the wants of starving men could be met out of the Common Good;" but when it was desired to find £500 for a banquet there was no difficulty whatever in getting it out of the Common Good. That being so it is not a desirable thing that the County

Councils should imitate the Town Councils in this matter. It has been suggested that it is wrong to give any money simply in relief of rates, and that if any money is to be given it should be ear-marked for a special purpose. I entirely dissent from that view. I do not believe in ear-marking. When the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to ear-mark certain taxes there was nobody more ready to denounce that than the colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench. If you want to give money for purposes for which Local Authorities are not at present empowered to levy rates, let the Local Authorities be invested with the necessary power to rate the inhabitants for such a purpose; but do not cripple the powers of Local Authorities. Local Authorities are much more sharply looked after than the Central Authorities, and manage their own affairs more in accordance with popular feeling and with greater economy. But, if you want to give money for a distinct and specific object, I would say, do not give any grants except in those cases in which your conditions are complied with, and unless you saw that you were getting value for the money. That was the mistake which was made in connection with free education. Grants were given to schools in which free education was not supplied. But if secondary education is to be provided by any Authority, School Board, or County Council, give no grant unless they carry out your policy, and then you can rely upon getting at least some value for your money. There is another point I would like to mention. I notice that the £110,000 for the half of the current year is dealt with in the Bill, and is also included in a Supplementary Estimate.

**THE LORD ADVOCATE:** It is dealt with by a clause in the Bill.

**\*DR. CAMERON:** If dealt with by a clause in the Bill, is there any object in having a Supplementary Estimate? Would it not be better since you have the Supplementary Estimate to take the Supplementary Estimate and vote the money at once. Then as to the permanent allocation. I do not see, from a practical point of view, how you can deal with it otherwise

than by Bill. If the £110,000 were now voted the Government would be in a position in which they would not be obliged to hurry forward the Bill in order to get it through by the 31st March, and the Scotch people would be allowed time for its consideration. I shall certainly not, Sir, follow the unusual course of opposing the First Reading of the Bill.

**MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.):** Our friends have come here with practical unanimity, and have spoken as if Glasgow represented the whole of Scotland. They make no recognition of the smaller towns, and speak as if Glasgow represents the condition and mind of Scotland as a whole. Now, Sir, the people of Glasgow are in the fortunate position of having very rich endowments available for the purposes of education, and they have urged that it is the duty of the Government to listen to the voice of the Parochial Boards and Town Council, and to exclude the whole of the rest of Scotland from this Bill. That has been the attitude of the Representatives of Glasgow all through. Sir, it seems to me that there now arises under this Bill an opportunity which will not occur again in a generation, of putting higher schools, secondary, continuations, and technical schools, on a footing which has been impossible in the past, and may be impossible in the future, unless this golden opportunity be seized. I recognise, with gratitude, what the right hon. Gentleman says. He put his finger on the sore when he said that in continuation schools in rural districts, where there is a large population, the difficulty is for the people to get for their children education within reach of their own homes. These people cannot afford to board their children out, cannot afford to send them to Glasgow or Edinburgh, or Aberdeen; and, therefore, I would impress upon the Lord Advocate the importance of these evening schools, and the necessity for disseminating them throughout the country districts. Although there are already educated persons there who would supply the teaching power, they have not the necessary laboratories, mechanical and other appliances, to put technical education in motion, neither have they

*Dr. Charles Cameron*

no money wherewith to meet such an expenditure. What is of more importance to three-fourths of the population than day schools is evening schools. No what you like, the fact remains that at 14 years of age the children are obliged to take service somewhere in the towns or villages or agricultural districts. Education is practically lost on them before they have reached the age of 21. If you establish these technical schools I will not say that everybody will go to them, but there are certainly many tradespeople and others who will do their best to avail themselves of these evening schools. Our country parishes are in a worse position than they were before the Education Act. Thanks to the good quality of many of the teachers in the parochial schools, there were always a number who took a great interest in promising scholars and brought them on to the University. But since the pressure of the Act of 1872 came the teachers have not been encouraged, and less has been done for higher education in the rural districts than was done before the passing of the Scotch Education Act. Now there is in this £265,000 great opportunity for providing well equipped evening schools, and I most earnestly press the Government not to be stinted in giving money for such a purpose. £60,000 out of £270,000 is a respectable sum to apply for such a purpose as that which I have mentioned. It is all very well to depreciate a smattering of higher education, but the more you get of the beginning of it the more you will get of the continuation of it, and the greater the number of scholars who spend a year at the secondary schools or at the Universities the better will it be for the country. I do not think that in this matter the voice of the counties has been sufficiently heard. I do not think the Government would listen to Glasgow, which is loaded in its wealth, for the purposes of secondary education. Let them rather listen to the voice of the people of Scotland. We have been twitted with the difference of opinion which has been disclosed on our Front Bench; but I think that the Member for Bridgeton has been drawn into the vortex of Glasgow. Perhaps, not being

a Scotchman, and not having the national instincts, he cannot so well appreciate rural Scotch education. Sir, the Parochial Boards cannot be said to be representative so long as the plural property vote exists, and I think this money should rather be given to the Town and County Councils, who are elected on a popular vote. If you distribute it in relief of rates you save them from the criticism of their own constituents. If you do not bind them down to that there will be a power over the popularly elected bodies which will make them consider whether they have been right or whether they have been wrong. My hon. Friend beside me (Mr. Hunter) will speak for the City, I speak for the County of Aberdeen, who have not, in my opinion, been sufficiently considered in this matter. Sir, these are the main considerations which I have to submit to the House. In the first place, you must take into consideration the great difference between the rural districts and small towns and the larger towns and cities. In the second place, this is the grandest opportunity that we shall ever see of completing secondary and higher education in Scotland, and I plead to the Government not to fix their minds too closely on the specific sum, because I believe it will be shown that £60,000 is far too little and far less than ought to be given for educational purposes. In the third place, I say that to whatever purpose you apply this money, so far as the counties are concerned, the very last purpose you should devote it to is the relief of the Parochial Boards. If you give it to them it will be an unqualified and unadulterated present to the landlords.

(9.30.) MR. W. A. HUNTER (North, Aberdeen): In the Bill now before the House the Government have made provision for the Universities; they have made provision for the middle class who are interested in secondary education; they have made ample provision for the landlord; but what have they done for a person not altogether to be ignored or despised—I mean the working man? Working men represent at least three out of the four millions of the people of Scotland; and I ask myself what provision is made in this Bill for the working men?



What good is it going to do them? The sum at the disposal of the Government in the present year is not less than £265,000. Out of that sum, the total, so far as I can see, which can ever reach the pockets of the working man, is £30,000. £235,000 is given to what I may call the upper ten per cent. of the ratepayers—the landowners; but as for three quarters of the population of Scotland, I will defy the Government to show that a single penny will be given to the working man beyond the paltry sum of £30,000 a year. Who found this money? Hon. Members opposite talk as if this money were manna rained from Heaven. I will not ask the House to rely upon my authority alone on a question of this financial character, but I may appeal to the authority of a gentleman who stands very high in the estimation of a Tory Government—I mean the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. That right hon. Gentleman, among the opinions which, I believe, he has never recanted, has long ago expressed the opinion that the working class pay at least one-half of the Imperial taxation. We know that in Scotland 70 per cent. of the whole of the Imperial taxation comes, not from property, but from the taxes on commodities which are consumed by all classes of the community. We have got £265,000 a year, of which £140,000, as near as possible, is presumably due to the working classes in Scotland. It is taken out of their pockets, and you give them back £30,000. To the working man, therefore, this Bill means a net loss of £100,000 or £110,000 a year. In fact, the whole of this system of financial legislation inaugurated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer is nothing more nor less than a fraudulent device by which money is taken out of the pockets of the working classes and put into the pockets of landowners and the richer classes of the community. This scheme of raising money by Imperial taxation and giving it to local rates is the grossest and most impertinent fraud that can possibly be attempted on the working man. Let anyone consider the different position in which the working man stands with regard to Imperial taxation

and local rates. I will take only one article—tobacco; and I will assume that a working man consumes only two ounces of tobacco in the week. That will be admitted to be the consumption of a moderate smoker. The duty which the working man pays upon two ounces of tobacco a week is equivalent to a poor rate in Scotland of 8s. in the pound on the average rent of the working man in Aberdeen. Consequently, a more ingenious, a more subtle device for robbing the poor and enriching the rich has never been devised than this most ingenious plan of raining gifts from heaven on the people of Scotland in the shape of relief of rates. Even in regard to the one part of the Government scheme which is not absolutely and wholly indefensible—I mean the provision they make with regard to education—the Government have carefully abstained from doing anything which will be of the slightest use to the working man in Scotland, and have skilfully drafted all their provisions for the exclusive benefit of the landlord class. There are still some elementary schools in Scotland in which fees are charged. Nothing is done by the Government to abolish this iniquitous impost. The most crying and urgent want of an educational system in Scotland is the want of evening continuation schools. Unfortunately, the exigencies of life compel working men to withdraw their children from school at a period at which their minds have not matured and the lessons they have received have not sunk deep into their minds, and it is of the utmost importance to the cause of education that these boys, when they leave school to commence work, should be taken up in the evening classes. What does this Bill do for evening classes? Not a word—not a whisper! Because these evening classes are intended for working men, and the Government have entirely forgotten the existence of the working man in Scotland. A question was put to the Lord Advocate as to what he meant by secondary education. No one could suppose it was possible for any Government to talk of secondary education as meaning anything which did not include technical education. But the Lord

*Mr. W. A. Hunter*

Advocate said he did not think that secondary education included technical education. I will not enlarge upon that point, because it is too absurd a position to take up. It is absolutely necessary, whatever money is spent on secondary education, that technical education shall hold the first place. I agree so far with my hon. friend the Member for the College Division that secondary education, *per se*, has not any claim or right to be maintained at the public expense. If it were a question purely of providing more than an elementary education, I doubt if you could make out a good claim upon the rates; but I think you can make out a good claim upon the rates if you so provide secondary education that every boy of real ability who ought to be educated shall, notwithstanding the poverty of his parents, have an opportunity of being educated. And I have always held that provision for secondary education in Scotland must be associated with a system of private bursaries or scholarships, by which the clever boys in the elementary schools shall be able to obtain that secondary education. There is a genuine public interest which shall justify expenditure out of the rates on secondary education. But in every provision made by the Government with regard to secondary education they entirely ignore the necessities and the wants of the working classes. The only thing they are thinking of is the wants of the middle and upper classes. I must say a word as to this high financial crime of taking money out of the pockets of the working men—out of their tobacco, whiskey, and tea—to enrich the landlords. I adhere strongly to the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, that on the whole the working classes do pay one-half of the Imperial taxation. Now, how much are the working classes going to get out of a reduction of the rates? Two years ago, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer tried this iniquitous device of robbing the working man, we defeated him by bringing forward an alternative scheme—namely, free education. And having an eye to the future, and being anxious to prevent any repetition, or attempted repetition, of

similar crimes, I moved in August, 1890, for a Return showing who were the persons who paid the rates in Scotland. That Return was to distinguish between dwelling houses, farms, and other property, and it would have given the most absolutely precise answer to the question—who is to get the money if you relieve the rates? In August, 1890, it was agreed that such a Return should be made, and the particular form of the Return was agreed to between the Government and myself. But I did not expect the Government would make the Return in the form proposed. I thought if I allowed three months for getting the information it was a reasonable time. Then I thought that if I allowed three months more, that would be sufficient for the delay in the Scotch Office. After more than that delay I received a communication from the Scotch Office asking me to agree to some slight modification of the Return, and of course I agreed. Then, later, an Order of this House was made for a Return of certain particulars, particulars which ought to have been returned. From the month of August down to the present time no such Return has been made, nor have I had any communication that such a Return is going to be made. And I am not going to deny that I do draw the inference that the Government are purposely keeping back that Return. And why? Because the moment that Return is made, it will be utterly impossible for any Government to propose to the people of Scotland to relieve the rates out of Imperial taxation, for, fortunately, although I have not got that Return, I have got figures which, for all practical purposes, serve the same end. I have got precise figures for Aberdeen; I have accurate figures for Glasgow, and equally accurate figures for Dundee. How does it stand for Aberdeen? It stands in this way with regard to the poor rate and the education rate: that three-fourths—that is, three out of four of the ratepayers—pay only one-eighth part of the gross rates. The result is, that if you give money to relieve the poor rate, three-fourths of the people of Aberdeen will only get one-eighth of that money. Now, with regard to the municipal rates—

there is a difference between them and the poor and the education rates. In the latter, half of the rate is paid by the owner, and that makes a material difference between the case of Scotland and that of England. In the case of the municipal rates, the owner in Aberdeen pays only about one-fourth; but it still remains that even with regard to these rates, three-fourths—that is to say, 18,000 out of 24,000—pay only one-fifth, or 18 per cent. of the municipal rates. Now, how does it stand in Glasgow? I was surprised that my right hon. Friend the Member for the Bridgeton Division (Sir G. Trevelyan) did not give us any information as to Glasgow; but I can give the information which he might have given, and which would have been exceedingly valuable and instructive to the House. Glasgow is a town where a very peculiar rule prevails—I believe it is the only town in Scotland where it does prevail—namely, that for the police rate persons who live in houses rented under £10 are charged only half the rate. It is the only town in Scotland where a graduated rate is introduced. Now, what is the result in Glasgow? I find, according to the figures I last got, that 85,000 ratepayers in Glasgow pay £37,000, in round numbers, out of a total rate of £381,000—that is to say, 85,000 of the ratepayers in Glasgow pay less than one-tenth of the municipal rates. Well, how many pay the rest? Thirty-four thousand pay the balance of these rates. Now, what is the result of giving £100,000 to the Municipal Authorities in Scotland so far as Glasgow is concerned? I will take the case of the 85,000 who, roughly speaking, may be called the working classes in Glasgow. The total sum that I suppose Glasgow would get will be about £14,000—perhaps a trifle more. Out of that sum, those who are paying under £5 of rent would receive 2½d. per annum; those who pay over £5 and under £8 would receive 4d. per annum; those who pay between £10 and £8 would receive 5½d. per annum—that is to say, 85,000 people in Glasgow would receive an average benefit under the Bill of 4d. in the year. This relief then of rates, which my right hon. Friend commends to us as so noble an

achievement, with his English notions—this ridiculous relief of rates to 85,000 people in Glasgow comes to the munificent sum of 4d. a year. But what does it come to for the richer ratepayers? Above the £10 line there are 34,000 ratepayers, and the average they would get would come to the magnificent sum of 5s. 8d. per annum. Just imagine the great merchants of Glasgow appreciating a gift like that. Now, these figures are absolutely exact. The proportion of rates paid by the great bulk of the people of Scotland is only one-tenth of the whole; and of course the necessary consequence follows. Now, Sir, it has been cast up to us that the Lord Provost of Aberdeen appeared before the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to advocate this odious and criminal abuse of public money—the application of money for relief of rates. Well, that is a fact that is naturally very impressive to right hon. Gentlemen like my Friend the Member for Bridgeton Division, who do not know Scotland: but those of us who have been born North of the Tweed put the proper valuation on facts of that kind. Why, everybody knows that in the Town Councils of Scotland it is absolutely impossible for a working man to be elected, except, of course, in the rarest possible cases. In my own constituency, although by far the larger number are working men, it is almost impossible. Working men cannot give up their employment and attend Town Council meetings in the middle of the day; and, consequently, the Town Council is almost invariably composed of the upper ten of the ratepayers. But there is another circumstance that my right hon. Friend may not know, and that is that, in Aberdeen at all events, members of the Town Council are not elected for political reasons. The present Lord Provost is what I believe they call a Liberal Unionist; and Tory Lord Provosts are very common in Aberdeen. A considerable number of our Town Councillors are of a political complexion wholly different from that of the constituency; and nothing could be more erroneous or foolish than to assume that the views of a Town Council on political questions at all harmonise with the views

*Mr. W. A. Hunter*

the constituency. I will tell you at the working men of Aberdeen of the subject, and that is much more important than the view of the Council. It was resolved at a meeting of the Trades Council of Aberdeen—

**That this Council petition the Members North and South Aberdeen asking them to use their influence to get the equivalent granted for some purpose—'anything, in fact' more beneficial to the working classes than of reducing the local rates."**

I have also had the opportunity of discussing this question with my constituents, and I know perfectly well that if any person should be so ill-advised as to come down to North Aberdeen and oppose me for protecting the interests of the working men against this disgraceful spoliation, he would show a very bad result at the election. I now come to the last point of my objection, which is to the manner in which the Government propose to deal with this question. I say that it is perfectly monstrous that a doomed Government, a Government that has already forfeited the respect and the confidence of the country, a doomed Government in a dying Parliament, should use a Tory English majority to vote upon the people of Scotland, and against the wishes of the Scotch Members, an abuse of their money totally repugnant to their desires and to their interests. I say—with the greatest respect—that this House has no right to dispose of this money beyond its own nation. The days, I hope, are few when I shall all be sent to our constituents, and when we come back from our constituents right hon. Gentlemen will not be sitting there; and, therefore, it is perfectly monstrous that they should use the Tory majority which they have at the present moment in order to force upon the people of Scotland a use of the money which is not supported and which will not be supported by the majority of the Scottish Members. It may be said that on a former occasion Parliament did deal with the Scottish distribution by means of a Bill—I mean the Local Government Bill of 1889. That is perfectly true, but on that occasion the Scotch opinion was perfectly unanimous. That was the Bill which abolished free education; and although

I always felt that it was a wrong thing in principle to fix the future distribution of money which had not yet been raised by the taxpayer by Act of Parliament, nevertheless on that occasion, when we were perfectly unanimous and there was no likelihood of our decision being reversed at a General Election, it would have been almost pedantic to have raised the objection at that time. But this is a different thing altogether. The First Lord of the Treasury is here taking money which is coming in the main out of the pockets of working men. He is giving it, to the amount of £60,000 at least, direct to the pockets of the landlords. As regards the bulk of the remainder, he is giving it to a very small section of the ratepayers. If this scheme is carried out in the form of a Bill, it could not be altered without the consent of the House of Lords, and it is perfectly monstrous that the people shall not, in the year after next, be able to dispose of their own money without the consent of the House of Lords. What is so objectionable is not only the wickedness of these proposals, but their absolute futility. If you give the £200,000 a year in aid of the rates, the sum which will reach the pocket of the ratepayer is absolutely insignificant. It would not give three-fourths of the people more than 10d. a head per annum, and the richer class would not get more than 10s. or 11s. a head. When once money has been raised by taxation, it is a thousand pities to fritter it away in those petty and almost inappreciable sums, and I should like to see this money employed on some large object. At present there does not exist sufficient unanimity amongst Scotch Members to justify us in asking the Government permanently to appropriate this money for any particular purpose. Suggestions have been made for providing for the unemployed and for artisans' dwellings, and there is also the important subject of making some better provision for old age than the workhouse, by pensions or annuities. The Sub-Committee—of which the Member for West Birmingham is the most conspicuous Member—appointed last year to consider that matter, is approaching the conclusion

of its labours, and in two or three weeks will have a definite scheme before it. The money the Government now spend on rates is amply sufficient to start a liberal scheme of pensions for old age, and I trust they will give up this unjustifiable intention, for if they persist in dealing with this matter by Act of Parliament, we shall be obliged to exhaust every Parliamentary resource to secure its defeat. On the other hand, if they bring forward their proposals in connection with the Estimates, they will only affect a year or a year and a half, and will not require the prolonged attention of Parliament.

(10.8.) MR. SHAW STEWART (Renfrew, East): I should not have taken part in this Debate if I did not see it to be thought there was no answer on this side of the House to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. Gentleman has the reputation of being somewhat in advance of his time, and he seems to have imagined to-night that the Dissolution had already taken place, and he was addressing meetings of his constituents during the heat of the election. I took down one or two of the epithets he applied to the Government scheme, which he has called a "criminal abuse, an iniquitous device, a disgraceful spoliation, and a financial crime." I think such objections should have been applied, if at all, to England. We have only to deal with the equivalent sum, and those arguments come too late. The hon. Member took no account of the Probate Duty, which forms a considerable bulk of the amount with which we are dealing. He fell foul of the right hon. Member for Bridgeton and spoke of him as an Englishman who favoured this allocation of the money in aid of the rates. As a Scotchman, I am a little surprised to find a Scotchman rebuking an Englishman for advising us to take advantage of a sum of money placed at our disposal, and I think on this occasion the Member for Bridgeton accurately represents the great preponderance of opinion amongst Scotch Members. We should be failing in our national characteristics if we were not to take advantage of this money, and apply it chiefly in relief of the rates. As to the scheme of pensions for old age, to which refer-

ence has been made, it should be dealt with, not in connection with the grant for Scotland, but as an Imperial measure affecting the whole of the three Kingdoms.

(10.13.) MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox): I think the Debate must have convinced the Government that it is unwise to proceed by Bill in this matter, as it would be opposed by almost every Scotch Member, and by means of every form of the House. On the other hand, if the Government proceed by way of Supplementary Vote, I do not think there would be any great opposition to the money going to the ratepayers, so far as the currents of the next year are concerned, provided the whole question is left open to be determined by a future Parliament. I object distinctly to the allocation of the Scotch money upon the principle of 11 per cent. for Scotland, 80 per cent. for England, and 9 per cent. for Ireland. The Probate Duty was allocated in the proportions in which it was collected from the three countries; but there is no analogy between this case and that of the Probate Duty, and Scotland ought to get her share of an education grant as part of the United Kingdom. In the English Acts, the amount is 10s. per child, and Scotland and Ireland are entitled to receive the same amount. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has got the Government into this difficulty owing to the fact that, for the first time in the history of the United Kingdom, he has opened separate accounts for the three separate nationalities. It is a strange irony of fate that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a Unionist Government has actually been the first to divide the Imperial accounts into national accounts, and has attempted to treat Scotland, not as part and parcel of the United Kingdom, but simply as partners in Imperial concerns with regard to certain specified financial interests. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would not have got himself into a difficulty if he had dealt with the amount as coming from the Imperial purse; he might then have said that the policy was one and the same for the whole kingdom, and have applied it equally to all parts. But when he introduced the principle that it was Scotch money,

*Mr. W. A. Hunter*

he admitted that it belonged to the Scotch people, and they ask that it shall be used according to their wishes, apart from Imperial policy. There is, of course, the greatest good feeling towards the Scotch Universities, but it must never be forgotten that according to the Treaty of Union the care and responsibility of the Universities was placed as a burden on the Imperial Exchequer. Attempts by Government to get rid of the obligation have been again and again defeated, and the Universities Bill was resisted until the Finality Clause was taken out of it. We object to recognise in any way the principle of the ratepayers having any responsibility whatever with regard to the up-keep of the Universities. Therefore, in resisting the grant of £30,000, we are not resisting the Universities having ample money for their work, but are resisting the suggestion that the burden should be put on the ratepayers instead of the Imperial Exchequer. In regard to the £60,000 for secondary education, it has been overlooked that in Scotland there is no such thing as elementary schools; the word "elementary" does not occur in the Scotch Education Act. On the contrary, there is a special clause providing that the standard of the old parochial schools shall not be lowered. The parochial school in Scotland is the feeder of the Universities, and, therefore, we maintain that secondary education qualifying for the Universities is part and parcel of the School Board education of Scotland, and that was in operation before the passing of the Education Act. Why has education in Scotland been lowered? It is because the Scotch Education Department gives the very same grant for the higher subjects that it does for the lower ones. The result was, that the teacher found it was more profitable to cultivate the lower specific subjects than to waste time on one or two higher subjects—as Greek, and Higher Mathematics—probably bringing in about 2s. a year per child. The result is, that the higher subjects have been driven from the parochial schools. The Scotch Education Department has done this evil, and they have the remedy in their own hands. By a slight alteration of the Code they can give lower grants to the lower specific subjects and higher grants

to the higher subjects. This would stimulate higher education. Another reason why the education has gone down is that the Department has done all it can to get everyone into the Board Schools, which have competed with the private schools to such an extent that the latter have been driven almost entirely out of existence, and those that are left are in a most crippled condition. Any attempt to bring secondary education into Scotland must be by reverting to the old process of the parish school, having secondary education as its final end. If you do that, your elementary education will be better also. It was the enthusiasm of the teacher which selected the brighter boys in the parochial school and sent them up to the Universities; but since this large sum of money has been given for education in Scotland, secondary education and the attendance at the Universities have both gone down rapidly. As an alteration of the Code would encourage secondary education; this grant of £60,000 is quite unnecessary for the purpose. By your past legislation and the proposals of this Bill you give the Parochial Board ratepayer about £100,000 a year. The Parochial Board ratepayer is the very man who pays the school rate. If by an alteration of the Code you ordered that every school in Scotland shall be free as regards elementary education up to any standard you like, the effect would be that you would put a burden on the ratepayers of £20,000 or £30,000 a year. But then you have given him, on the other hand, £100,000 a year by your grants; so that if you give all this money to the ratepayer, you give him relief from taxation, and you can couple with the gift the condition that the School Boards shall free elementary education throughout Scotland. If you give the whole of the money to the ratepayer, and then make the School Boards give free education, you are practically doing the same thing as far as dividing the money between Parochial Boards and School Boards is concerned. But in matters of this kind it is impossible to proceed by way of a Bill. You will have to fight the application of the money clause, and you will have to fight the question of the permanency, and there would not

be enough time for the House to go into a Bill of such contentious nature. If, however, they are willing to proceed by estimate, there is no reason why the Vote for this year should not be granted within a couple of hours, and no reason why the permanency should not be passed in about the same period of time; and there is evidently no other specific scheme; but to give the money to the ratepayers in the meantime is a matter on which all the Scotch Members will unite.

\*(10.32.) MR. S. WILLIAMSON (Kilmarnock, &c.): I think, Sir, that Grants-in-aid, both on the ground of principle and of political inconvenience, are wrong. But we are not responsible for proposals of this character. A certain sum of money falls in equity to the share of Scotland corresponding to that given to England, and it is quite fair that we should get it, and reasonable that we should take it. The Government are responsible for creating a great thirst in Scotland for this money, and they have now the obligation resting on them of trying to satisfy it. I hope they will do so by Estimate and not by Bill. The demands of the Parochial Boards appear to me to be popular demands, and as I see no proposals before the House of an alternative character, I am prepared to say that, as far as the grants to County Councils and Parochial Boards are concerned, they are fair and reasonable proposals. The allocation to the Parochial Boards must be somewhat definite, but I hope there may be a larger share of liberty given to the Town and County Councils. I trust the Government will see the advantage of proceeding by estimate. We all have our schemes for the distribution of the money. There is the plan of the hon. Member for North Aberdeen, who has a scheme for national pensions; and though it may not at present be in a form to come before the House, we should not shut the door against it next year or the year after that. I should like to have a large slice of this money for fishery harbours. There is a splendid opportunity of doing a great deal of good—providing cheap food, helping the fishermen, and providing for manning the Navy in time of need. I hope the Government may yet see

*Mr. Caldwell*

the desirability of devoting some part of this money to the improvement of fishery harbours.

\*(10.35.) SIR C. J. PEARSON: I do not propose in the few remarks I have to make to range over the whole of this discussion, because I think it would not be well if I were to do more than refer to those considerations which touch the question whether the Bill should be introduced or not. I do not propose to say anything as to the mode in which the amount of the grant is fixed, or as to the policy which Parliament has endorsed as to the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account. Nor do I propose to solve the doubts which have been raised, especially on the Front Bench opposite, whether, and how far, the representatives of the people in various bodies represent their constituents in this matter. There has been disclosed an interesting divergence of opinion on this subject, and I leave right hon. Gentlemen to settle it among themselves. I should have thought that the ordinary mode in which an opinion is expressed in such matters had been sufficiently followed to the knowledge of hon. Members to make it clear to them that there is a considerable body of united opinion on the question of whether some substantial part of this sum should not be devoted to the relief of local rates. But it seems to be doubtful in the minds of some hon. Gentlemen opposite whether representative institutions fulfil their functions in this matter, and whether hon. Members themselves, on the eve of what has been termed a dying Parliament, have a sufficient mandate from their constituents to safely express an opinion on this question. Nor do I propose to enter upon the larger question which has been dangled before the House without any attempt to pit it against the Government proposals—I mean the large national question that has been shadowed forth. I shall therefore address myself, and I shall do so very briefly, to one or two of the more practical questions which have been mooted with regard to the proposals which the Government make in the Bill. In the first place, let me say that with regard to the £110,000 there could not be a greater mistake than to say, as has been said by the right

1. Member for Stirling Burghs, that any way whatever the House of Commons was compromised by the action of the Government in that question. The truth of the matter is this. When my right hon. Predecessor was asked in the House of Commons whether the amount accruing during this financial year should be distributed according to one principle or another, it was conceded on all hands that a large portion of the total amount should be devoted to the relief of local rates; and inasmuch as that was conceded—and no word was raised in the House when that statement was made—inasmuch as it was conceded that a large portion of the amount could be so devoted, it was proposed, and reasonably and properly proposed, that the whole of that smaller sum which was raised during the current financial year should be devoted in that way, in order to avoid the double discussion which would be necessitated if it been appropriated upon what I may call a more permanent basis. In reference to the question of grant, I think I made it clear enough that this amount is to vary in the proportion which I have indicated, as the English amount varies, and that surplus, if there be a surplus, the figures which I mentioned to the House, will be contributed to the relief of local rates. With respect to the fact that this Bill makes mention of the relief of the burden remaining on elementary education, which has been made an objection to the Bill, I have only to say that it seems to me that the objection hanging in it that should be considered. I believe that to devote any substantial part of this grant in that direction would operate most unfairly and unequally, and that it would do so, not only in an unappreciable degree where it was so applied, but would necessitate a corresponding amount to those parts of the country which had no need of it, because they had been met by the grant already given. With reference to the suggestion that has been made that the grant proposed for secondary education should not be placed in the Minutes of the Department but be laid upon the Table of Parlia-

ment, but should be remitted to the Local Bodies and County Councils, the effect of that would be to produce something like dual control in the matter of education. I leave this matter where I have left it at the present stage of the Bill, and I propose upon the Second Reading to lay before the House a scheme shadowing forth what is proposed as regards the distribution of this part of the grant. I hope it will not be understood that, with regard to the grant proposed to the Universities, it is the intention either of myself personally or of the Government to interfere with the position which those Universities undoubtedly hold under the Statute. I do not myself, however, see that this is any reason whatever why the Universities should not obtain the benefits that we propose to confer upon them by this grant. I think there may be a distinction between the maintenance of the Universities and their improvement and extension; but I cannot see how anyone can say that their statutory position is affected by the proposals laid before the House. As to the relief of rates, I do not propose to add anything to what I have said. There is on this point also a most interesting difference of opinion, and so far from my feeling that that difference of opinion is a reason for not submitting the proposals to the House, it seems to me that the proposals we have submitted will be far more likely to command confidence in Scotland, just because the matter we submit has received, as it is receiving, full discussion. It is said by one section that the local Parliaments, as they are called, ought to have the full and free disposal of this money for any purpose they please, from secondary education down to model lodging houses. It strikes me that this is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the subject. The idea of putting the improvement of secondary education in Scotland on a footing like that seems to me, with great deference to the right hon. Gentleman who suggested it, to show an entire want of appreciation of the necessities of the situation and of what is likely to tend to the improvement of that education as an organised system. It seems to me it would leave the matter to a variety of



fluctuating opinions in the bodies that would have to deal with this money, and would, therefore, leave it in a loose and unsatisfactory position. With reference to the special question that has been raised, as to whether the Government has forgotten the existence of the working man—I am sorry the hon. Member is not in his place, or I would remind him—but I would remind the House that the money we are dealing with practically comes, not from Imperial taxation generally, but is the outcome of special taxes which have been assigned towards relieving local taxation; and that being so, it would be necessary, not merely to consider how much the poor man pays for his tobacco and his tea, but how much there is paid in respect of the Probate Duty, and it is quite out of reason to say that the poor man gets no benefit, and is not taken into account. I think I have now dealt with most of the points that have been appropriately raised at this stage.

(10.55.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have been informed by the highest authority in the House that there exists the gravest doubt as to whether the Bill which my right hon. Friend has introduced ought not to be introduced in Committee. In order, therefore, that the House may not come to a decision which may possibly turn out to be nugatory, I beg to move that the Debate be adjourned until it is ascertained what is the proper course to pursue.

Motion made and Question proposed,  
"That the Debate be now adjourned."  
—(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the course proposed by the right hon. Gentleman is the right one, and would be the more convenient.

DR. CAMERON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman when it is proposed that the Second Reading should take place?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the doubt which I have stated to the House as existing prove to be well founded, of course it will have to be introduced in Committee.

*Sir C. J. Pearson*

DR. CAMERON: But that would take no time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We shall not be able to take the Second Reading for some time, as we have other Second Readings. Besides, I think it is only fair that the Bill should be considered by the people of Scotland.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I hope this will be a lesson to the right hon. Gentleman, who is now the Leader of the House, not in future to waste time, but to consult with the authority of the House before introducing Bills.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Bill will be printed before the Estimates are brought in, as the Bill bears upon the Votes?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If it is to be taken as an honourable understanding that there is to be no debate the Bill would be brought in before the Estimates.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman should imply that there has been waste of time already. The discussion which has taken place, which I admit has been lengthened, is still not surprising, considering the importance of the question. I assure the right hon. Gentleman that there was no desire to prolong the debate unduly.

MR. SOMERVELL (Ayr, &c.): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury as to the £110,000; how it is to be applied; whether by Resolution or embodied in a clause in the Bill? If the Bill is not passed by the 31st March I understand we will lose it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have to say in answer to the hon. Member that the grant he refers to will be embodied in a Bill, but I hope none of the serious results he has anticipated will ensue.

Motion agreed to.

Debate adjourned till to-morrow.

#### NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

##### LEAVE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [22nd February].  
"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to improve National Education in Ireland."

ion again proposed.

e resumed.

1) MR. M. J. KENNY (Mid): I beg to move the ment of the Debate. It will embered that this discussion 1 at a very late hour on last day, and the discussion lasted it an hour and a-half in the of my hon. Friend the Mem- West Belfast and some other riends; and the right hon. an the First Lord of the Trea- Question time this evening, gave rtaking to my hon. Friend the for West Belfast that the discussion of this Bill would aken after half past 10 o'clock. w 11 o'clock, and, therefore, I move the Adjournment of the

n made, and Question proposed, he Debate be now adjourned." M. J. Kenny.)

1 THE CHIEF SECRETARY ELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, fter the observations of the ntleman as to the absence n. Member for West Belfast, r the undertaking given in ly part of the evening, of shall agree to the Motion Debate be adjourned.

1 agreed to.

3 further adjourned till To-

## RDERS OF THE DAY.

—CIVIL SERVICES AND REVE- DEPARTMENTS, 1891-2 (SUP- LEMENTARY ESTIMATES.)

ered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

### CLASS I.

'35, Supplementary, Houses of nt Buildings.

100, Supplementary, Art and buildings, Great Britain.

.000, Supplementary, Revenue nt Buildings, Great Britain.

3, Supplementary, Lunacy on, Scotland.

[NEW SERIES.]

### CLASS II.

5. £1,690, Supplementary, Public Works Office, Ireland.

### CLASS III.

6. £2,000, Supplementary, Law Charges.

7. Motion made, and Question pro- posed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of pay- ment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1892, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Police Courts of London and Sheerness."

(11.8.) MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I do not want to go over the arguments in regard to the scandalous character of this particular Vote, but it is well known that almost every Gentleman on this side of the House who does not happen to be a London Member is of opinion that any charge for the Police Courts of London ought to be thrown upon London itself. We are obliged to pay a sum towards the Bow Street Court because some extradition cases are tried there; but we on this side of the House do not see why we should be obliged to pay for Police Courts at Sheerness and Wandsworth and other places in the vicinity of London. Though really anxious as I am to expedite Public Business—

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. COURTNEY, Cornwall, Bodmin): The hon. Gentle- man is not to enter into the subject of the original Vote, except so far as it is necessary to illustrate the present Vote.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I merely wish to point out how monstrous and excessive the original Vote was, and how super-monstrous it is to ask us to pay £100 more. I certainly shall divide on this Vote.

(11.10.) DR. CLARK (Caithness): It certainly happens in our country that we have to pay all these charges out of local rates; and when we clean our Courts and have these medical witnesses we pay for, it is not out of the Imperial Exchequer, but from the local rates; and I think it is right that the people of London should be in the same position as all the people in the provinces, and that they

should put their hands in their pockets and pay for the cleaning of their Courts, and not ask the poorer parts of the country, such as Caithness, to pay for it. I join with my hon. Friend in protesting against this Vote.

(11.12.) MR. MORTON (Peterborough): I certainly objected last Session to pay these expenses out of Imperial Funds, whereas the expenses for other Courts outside London have to be paid by the constituencies themselves. I join in the objection to this Vote for £100; and I think we ought to have some explanation from the right hon. Gentleman why he wants more than was voted last year. I am not aware of any reason why the Courts should want more cleaning this year than the year before, or why they should want more cleaning than was estimated during the last Session. I object to this Vote, therefore, on two grounds—the one is, that we ought not to be called upon to vote this sum out of the Imperial Funds at all; and the other is, that we have had no explanation from the right hon. Gentleman at all as to the reasons for asking these supplementary sums.

\*(12.15.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY, Sheffield, Hallam): The explanation of the necessity for the sum stated in the Supplementary Estimates for which we have had to apply is this. The House will remember that a Committee was appointed under the presidency of Mr. Justice Wills for the purpose of seeing what improvements were necessary to be made in certain of the Police Courts for the better accommodation of untried prisoners. The recommendations of this Committee have led to a very considerable enlargement of some of the Courts and an increase in the number of cells, and further improvements. That necessitated considerably increased labour for cleaning. These improvements proceeded gradually step by step, and some of the expense has fallen outside the time in which the ordinary Estimates could be presented to Parliament.

(12.18.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): When we ask for money for improving the Courts in Green Street, in Dublin, as we have done

over and over again, not one single sixpence can be screwed out of the English Treasury, and we have been met practically with a stern refusal unless the Corporation pays a certain amount. But the moment Mr. Justice Wills says he is not quite comfortable because there is a draught on his poll, there is an Estimate for better accommodation presented to Parliament. The explanation of the hon. Gentleman is quite acceptable, and we shall know how to turn it to account at the proper moment.

MR. MORTON: The hon. Gentleman did not explain as regards the medical fees. I know there were very many complaints, especially during last August, of the want of medical attendance. In one case a prisoner died who was said to be drunk, and I think there should be more attention paid to these police cases by the medical officers. I should like to have a little explanation of this item.

\*MR. STUART-WORTLEY: The amount for the medical witnesses' fees fluctuates very much, and is an item extremely difficult to estimate; but it forms a very small portion of this Estimate which is applied for.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 125; Noes 90.—(Div. List, No. 7.)

Resolutions to be reported.

CLASS V.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £22,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1892, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."

MR. MORTON (Peterborough): I see in this Vote a sum of £5,000 for telegrams "consequent on the state of affairs in America and China." The only information we have on these matters is contained in the daily paper. No right hon. or hon. Gentleman has given us any information. I gather from the daily papers that there have been difficulties in China with regard to the missionaries, and that, no doubt, put the Government to extra expense. I am still in some difficulty with regard to America. An hon. Gentleman beside me says he does not know where America

I am glad we adopted free education last year, for in the future people will get to know where America is. Sir, I have not been able to gather from the newspapers any information as to any extraordinary condition of affairs in America. I do not know whether the extra expenditure arises in connection with the election of the President. Three years ago we tried to interfere. Whether that is the way this money has been expended I do not say. I trust we shall have more information.

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, North): I hope to be able to satisfy the hon. Member by saying, shortly, as he said in the Debate on the Address, that with regard to China, Papers have been in an active state of preparation and will shortly be laid upon the Table. A considerable apprehension was excited during the autumn of last year in reference to the anti-foreign riots that took place in various parts of China. It became necessary to enter into telegraphic communication with Her Majesty's Representative at Peking, which, as the hon. Gentleman is aware, is a considerable distance from London, and the cost of telegrams to Peking and back is very considerable. With regard to America, the telegrams which have passed between Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Representative in Washington were due to the protracted negotiations which have been in course of progress during the autumn in reference to Behring Sea. America also comprises South America, and, as the hon. Member is probably aware, there was a revolution in Chili in the autumn, by which British interests were considerably affected and angered, and it became necessary to communicate very frequently by telegraph with Her Majesty's Representative in that country. Papers on that subject are being prepared, and I hope to lay them on the Table next week.

**MR. MORTON**: Can you say what portion of this extra expenditure is applicable to Chili, and what is applicable to America?

**MR. J. W. LOWTHER**: I am afraid I cannot answer that question straight

**MR. MORTON**: I think the hon. Gentleman has made out my case, and I think I may appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury to have this Vote postponed. We ought to have the Blue Book promised by the hon. Gentleman before voting this money, and with regard to America we should have more information.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: The Government have no desire to take any controversial Votes to-night, and I do not think this is a controversial Vote. The extra expenditure was owing to the telegrams rendered necessary by the peculiar state of things in America and China, and on the ordinary Estimates the hon. Gentleman will have ample opportunity of discussing the policy of the Government in these matters. The question of policy does not now arise. I hope the Vote may now be taken.

**MR. LABOUCHERE**: Nobody admires more than I do the strenuous exertions in the interests of economy of my hon. Friend third behind me (Mr. Morton), but at the same time I think he is now going a little too far. There were difficulties in China, and whether Her Majesty's Government conducted the negotiations properly or not, telegrams had to be exchanged. There was a mistake about the Behring Sea dispute, and about that it was also necessary that telegrams should be exchanged. I should be sorry if by any premature vote my hon. Friend abridged our opportunities of going fully into these matters hereafter.

**MR. MORTON**: I do not object to my hon. Friend intervening. I do not object to these telegrams. I said I knew there were troubles in China; but I said that as a matter of principle we ought to have this information before voting this money. I move that Item E. be reduced by £200.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item E (Telegrams), be reduced by £200."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

**MR. T. M. HEALY**: I should like to know when the Chilean Papers will be produced. We do not condemn the action of Her Majesty's Consul there; but we have some observations to make with regard to some other Representative of Her Majesty's Government there. We are anxious to see the instructions given to Her Majesty's

Minister. I think Her Majesty's Government acted very properly, but I should like to see the exact instructions they gave.

(11.40.) MR. D. CRAWFORD (Lanark, N.E.): I quite agree with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). I do not think that an item for telegrams is a very suitable occasion for opposition on our part. We may think, and I suppose we do think, that the administration of these matters might be placed in other hands when the administration would better command the confidence of the country; but so long as the country leaves the present Government with power, I think it is unworthy of the Liberal Party to take a Division on this Vote of £5,000 for telegrams. I have perfect confidence that the right hon. Gentleman opposite has formed a just and proper decision as to the expenditure of such a sum as this. I do not think we ought to make this a subject for division; we have much more important subjects than this, upon which we shall have to join issue with the Government.

(11.41.) MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I do not agree with the hon. Member for Lanark (Mr. Crawford); I think this is an unprecedented—a monstrous—sum to ask for telegrams in a Supplementary Estimate. Look at the original sum asked for last year—£14,000—and here we are asked to vote £5,000 in addition without any explanation of the causes requiring this enormous expenditure. I think we might be told what portion of the expense is due to affairs in China, and what portion to America or to Chili. For my part, I confess I think if the Government had abstained from interference in Chilean affairs and had sent fewer telegrams there, it would have been better. I think that most of the troubles arose in Chili, if not from the interference of the British Government, yet from the attitude of British subjects there. That, however, is a matter of opinion. In the first place, I object to the Vote because it is too large; and, in the second place, we have not the information to justify us in voting so large a sum; and I think these Estimates are prepared in a way that seems to me disrespectful to the Com-

mittee. We have not definite information. Part of the amount is debited to the negotiations in reference to the Behring Sea Fisheries, but it will be observed that the next item is one of £7,000 for the Behring Sea Commission, and I do not see why the cost for telegrams in this connection should not be charged to the expenses of that Commission. I should like also, before the Vote is passed, to have some assurance that we shall have, during the Session, an opportunity to discuss, with due information before us, the policy of the Government in reference to their interference in the affairs of Chili.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR assented.

(11.44.) DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Of course I fully recognise the argument of the hon. Member for North-East Lanark (Mr. Crawford), but, at the same time, I think hon. Members will recognise the fact that upon many of these apparently trivial items, even on such an item as this for telegrams, very great points of policy have frequently been threshed out in Committee of Supply. There can be no doubt, from the various remarks which have been made in the course of the last few minutes, that this question of telegrams does attach itself in an intimate degree with the state of affairs in Chili, in China, and other places. I do not wish to go into details upon these matters, but it strikes me as a matter of convenience and common-sense after having heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman who is new to his office as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and we having also another neophyte in the position of Secretary to the Treasury, it does seem to me that these gentlemen are not really in a position to give us that full information to which we are entitled when dealing with these matters. I do not wish to raise any captious controversy, or put any foolish questions, but here is a large sum charged—large for the purpose—and it is our business to know how, and why, the money is spent. For this reason I support my hon. Friend (Mr. Morton). In a somewhat diffident way the Under Secretary has expressed himself, and we are promised Blue Books which, I think, ought to be in our hands when we are

*Mr. T. M. Healy*

asked to vote this money. Under the circumstances, I do think that the First Lord of the Treasury, whose ability we recognise, would do well to postpone the Vote now, giving to his two neophytes the opportunity to make themselves acquainted with all the facts, and so we shall dispose of the Vote with full information before us.

(11.47.) Mr. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but the CHAIRMAN withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Debate resumed.

(11.47.) Mr. T. M. HEALY: Will the hon. Gentleman say when we shall have the Blue Books he has mentioned?

\*(11.47.) Mr. J. W. LOWTHER: I cannot say definitely. I had hoped they would have been circulated before now. I will inquire, and will push forward the work as rapidly as possible.

(11.48.) Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): When reference is made to Chili, we cannot but be aware of certain very suspicious circumstances in connection with British interests there, so that I certainly think we ought to have Papers on the subject. I do not wish to interpose any undue delay in the proceedings of the Committee, but somehow of late years a bad custom has grown up—a double-barrelled, bad custom. I might say, first of all, the ordinary Votes are taken so late that we have not time to discuss them, and then, on the other hand, when we approach these Votes early in the Session we are told discussion is premature. Are we premature in seeking a discussion on this the proper opportunity, and why should we wait until the autumn? As regards affairs in Chili, distinctly I am of opinion, and it is an opinion I think will be shared by all Members who are interested in the comity of nations, that we should have full information before we vote this large sum, part of which is due to negotiations arising out of suspicious circumstances in relation to the revolutionary movement in that country.

(11.49.) Dr. CLARK (Caithness): I would appeal to my hon. Friend to withdraw his Motion for the reduction of the Vote. I do not see

that he has given sufficient ground for it. I am quite willing to debate the question as one of expenditure on telegrams; but as a matter of the policy of the Government in Chili or in China, we shall have better opportunity for discussion on the Foreign Office Vote, and on the Admiralty Vote will arise the question of the conveyance of specie. There is no question of policy indirectly arising on this Vote for telegrams that could not better be discussed on the Foreign Office Vote.

(11.49.) Mr. MORTON: I trust that even now the Government will consent to postpone this Vote. Personally, I do not wish to take a Division. I do not oppose the item, for, indeed, I do not know the particulars, nor does any Member of the Committee. Possibly, the Government may feel stronger, being re-inforced by the assistance of the hon. Members for Northampton, North-East Lanark, and Caithness, but what they have said does not alter my opinion as to the facts of the case. There was one point particularly mentioned by the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), who pointed out that while the total sum asked for last year was £14,000, we are now asked to vote a supplementary sum nearly a third of the original sum, and yet not the slightest information is given as to the expenditure of the money. We are told that in a day or two Blue Books will be laid on the Table, but, apparently, the Under Secretary cannot give us any information now. Well, then, there is a sufficient reason for postponing the Vote. I find it stated that part of the amount is consequent upon the state of affairs in America, and I am reminded that this may include South America, but our information does not say so. In answer to the question from myself the Under Secretary frankly owned he could not tell us how much of the money was spent in relation to Chili, and how much in relation to the United States. With this absence of information it is absurd to ask us to take the Vote tonight. I make no charge of improper expenditure, but, as a matter of principle, I say before we pass the Vote we are entitled to require information

about it. I am sorry the Government do not see this. It can make no difference to them if the Vote is postponed for a day or two. If they had acquiesced in the suggestion they would have saved time, and by now we might have passed a number of other Votes. As it is, I do not see my way to withdraw my Motion for a reduction, although I should be sorry to take a Division. I should be much better pleased if the Government would consent to postpone the Vote until they could give us the required information. As I have said, this is a matter of principle, and I emphasise the point because it refers, perhaps, to hundreds of Votes on the Estimates. We are entitled to have the fullest possible information when we take the Votes, and not afterwards. It is ridiculous to ask for the Vote and say we shall have the information at some future time. Another point has been raised by the hon. Member who mentioned the Behring Sea Fisheries Commission; and, certainly, I think that if any of this expenditure is due to that account, it should be included in Item "M." I quite understand why this should be a separate item, but it does not represent the expenses of the Commission if the telegraphic expenses are not included.

(11.58.) MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Stockport) rose in his place and claimed to move "That the Question be now put;" but the Chairman withheld his assent, and declined then to put that question.

Debate resumed.

MR. MORTON continued: I do trust the right hon. Gentleman will consent to postpone the Vote. I am anxious not to take a Division, but to obtain information which we have a right to demand with the Vote before us. It is very well for the Leader of the House to tell us that opportunities for discussion will arise later in the Session; but I am sorry to say that, so far as my limited experience goes, we do not get those opportunities. If we leave matters over until the regular Estimates for the year are before us, we shall find ourselves in exactly the position we were in last year at the end of the Session, when Votes for millions of money were forced through

*Mr. Morton*

at late hours of the night when public discussion was impossible. It is absurd to tell us to take our chance of another opportunity; we shall never get our opportunity unless we make it. I have made up my mind that we can only hope for discussion early in the Session, and whenever matters require it I shall endeavour to raise discussion on Supplementary Estimates and Votes on Account. So far as I have been able to read the newspapers, and that is the only source of information in regard to this expenditure—and I admit that hon. Members have a right to laugh, for it is ridiculous that Members of the British House of Commons should have to go to the daily Press for information they ought to obtain here—the greater part of this expenditure arises upon a subject fairly open to our discussion—the foreign policy of the Government.

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.

Committee also report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

#### MILBANK PRISON BILL.—(No. 140.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

(12.2.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): Yesterday, at an hour equivalent to this, when we had a Bill before us to which no opposition was expected, the Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, the First Lord of the Treasury, in a manner as offensive to Irish Members as he could make it, refused to allow progress to be made with the Bill. I therefore now move that you report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again," put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

# **LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ACQUISITION OF LAND) BILL.—(No. 139.)**

## **SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Knowles.*)

(12.4.) **MR. M. J. KENNY** (Tyrone, Mid): This is rather a technical Bill; may I suggest that the hon. Gentleman should give us some explanation of it?

(12.4.) **MR. KNOWLES** (Salford, W.): A memorandum on the back of the Bill sets out in concise and clear terms the object of the Bill, and I do not know that I can give an explanation in a better form, and so I will read the memorandum as follows:—

"Assurances by deed of land for the purposes of a public park, a schoolhouse, an elementary school, or a public museum, or for the purpose of providing dwellings for the working classes in any populous place, are already exempted from the operation of Parts I. and II. of the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, 1888. It is proposed by this Bill to extend that exemption to all assurances by deed of land to Local Authorities for any purpose for which such authorities are authorised to acquire land. The restrictions on the assurances of land which it is proposed to remove occasionally create very great local inconvenience. For instance, if a landowner wishes to grant a plot of land, however small, to a local authority for any public purpose, other than one of those specially exempted from the operation of Parts I. and II. of the above-mentioned Act, 'without full and valuable consideration,' the deed must within six months of its execution be enrolled in the central office of the Supreme Court of Judicature, and if the grantor dies within twelve months of the execution of the deed, the grant is void."

I may add that I noticed in yesterday's papers the case of a grant of land to which the Bill would apply. Supposing the grantor should die within 12 months, then the grant would be void.

(12.6.) **MR. CHANCE** (Kilkenny, S.): Are we to assume from the silence of the Government that they approve of the Bill?

(12.6.) **THE ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): The principle is one which I think may be conceded, but I do not pledge myself to the details.

(12.6.) **MR. T. M. HEALY** (Longford, N.): Will the hon. Gentleman

say is it the same Bill which was read a second time last year? Does it apply to Ireland?

(12.6.) **MR. KNOWLES**: The same Bill, and it does not apply to Ireland.

(12.6.) **MR. ESSLEMONT** (Aberdeen, E.): Does it apply to Scotland.

**MR. KNOWLES**: No.

Objection being taken to further proceeding, Debate adjourned till tomorrow.

## **MOTIONS.**

### **SHERIFF CLERKS DEPUTE (SCOTLAND) BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Philipps, Bill to improve the position of Sheriff Clerks Depute in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Philipps, Mr. Haldane, Mr. M'Ewan, and Mr. Sinclair.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 197.]

### **COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1887) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. David Thomas, Bill to amend "The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887," and to provide for the giving of certificates to workmen on leaving their employment in Mines, ordered to be brought in by Mr. David Thomas and Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda).

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 198.]

### **POOR LAW (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.**

On Motion of Mr. Mahony, Bill to amend the Poor Law (Ireland) Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Mahony, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Carew, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, and Mr. Harrison.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 199.]

## **TOWN HOLDINGS.**

Ordered, That the Select Committee be re-appointed to inquire into that portion of the original reference to the Committee which the Committee was precluded by want of time from reporting on last Session, namely, "into the question of imposing a direct assessment on the owners of ground rents, and on the owners of increased values imparted to land by building operations or other improvements."

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Twenty-three Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of,—Mr. Tyssen Amherst, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Baumann, Mr. Beadel, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Crilly, Sir John Ellis, Mr. Elton, Mr. Esslemont, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Lawson, Sir William Marriott, Colonel Nolan, Sir Charles Pearson, Mr. Randall, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Mark Stewart, and Mr. Powell-Williams.



Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas*.)

#### TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS (INSPECTION COMMITTEE).

Copy ordered—

"Of Scheme for the appointment of an Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks; for determining the mode in which the members of the Committee are to be appointed, and their term of office; and, subject to the provisions of 'The Savings Banks Act, 1891' (54 and 55 Vic., c. 21), their powers, procedure, and duties; together with a list of Members of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 86.]

#### ENDOWED CHARITIES (CAMBRIDGE).

Copy ordered—

"Of Digest of the Endowed Charities in the county of Cambridge, the particulars of which are recorded in the books of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, but are not recorded in the general digest of Endowed Charities for that county, 1863-4 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 433 (16), of Session 1868)."—(*Mr. Brand*.)

#### RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR) COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That Sir Edward Reed be discharged from the Committee on Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).

Ordered, That Mr. Flynn be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas*.)

#### RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.

Ordered, That all Bills of the present Session to confirm Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888," containing the Classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges applicable thereto, be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to communicate this Resolution and desire their concurrence.—(*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*.)

#### RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES PROVISIONAL ORDER [NORTH LONDON, &c.] BILL.

Order [10th February, 1892,] that the Railway Rates and Charges Provisional Order [North London, &c.] Bill be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, read and discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.—(*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*.)

#### RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND). 1890-91.

Return ordered—

"Of Particulars of Relief Works undertaken in certain parts of Ireland in the latter end of 1890, and in 1891."—(*Mr. Jackson*.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 85.]

#### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, &c.)

Address for—

"Return showing the number of days the Judges of the Queen's Bench Division were absent from London on the business of the Assizes held in 1891, and stating the amounts paid to them and the circuit officers for allowances and expenses."—(*Mr. Morton*.)

#### ALLOTMENTS ACTS (ACQUISITION OF LAND BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Returns ordered—

"Of the number of instances in which (1) Rural Sanitary Authorities, under the provisions of 'The Allotments Act, 1887,' and (2) County Councils, under the provisions of the Allotments Acts, 1887 and 1890, have acquired land for allotments by (1) compulsory purchase; (2) purchase by agreement; (3) hire by agreement; showing, in each case, the parish within which such land has been acquired, the acreage, and the number of tenants to whom allotments have been let under the Act.

"And, of the Rural Sanitary Authorities who have not taken land for Allotments, and in each case the reasons why the Authority have not provided land for the purpose, whether in consequence of their deeming it unnecessary to do so, or otherwise."—(*Mr. Channing*.)

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE IN PORTS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Address for—

"Return of the names and descriptions of the Justices assigned to keep the Peace in all Ports in England and Wales having a separate Commission of the Peace, distinguishing as far as possible those Justices who own ships, or shares in ships, or in companies owning ships, from the others."—(*Mr. Chamberlain*.)

House adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday, 26th February, 1892.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

red, That the evening sitting of the on Tuesday next, and on all subsequent ys during the present Session, do nce at half-past Five o'clock, unless ouse shall otherwise order. — (*The res of Salisbury.*)

House adjourned at half-past  
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 26th February, 1892.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

FAST CITY CENTRAL STATION  
AND RAILWAYS BILL.

SECOND READING.

ler for Second Reading read.

tion made, and Question proposed,  
at the Bill be now read a second

3.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.):  
Bill proposes to take down St.  
's Catholic Church at Belfast, and  
his the Bishop and clergy  
t, unless they have a site for  
e-erection of the church secured  
them by the promoters of  
Bill. To-day I have received a  
from the solicitor to the pro-  
s, to the effect that an arrangement  
een arrived at with the engineer of  
cheme by which a site shall be  
ded for another church, supposing  
required to take down the existing  
h, and upon this undertaking,  
if possible, site No. 1 shall be  
able, or, if that is not possible,  
site No. 2, I offer no opposition  
a Bill.

tion agreed to.

l read a second time, and com-  
d.

DL I.

[NEW SERIES.]

BELFAST CORPORATION (LUNATIC  
ASYLUMS, &c.) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That the Bill be now read a second  
time."

(3.10.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.):  
This Bill has two objects, both of which  
I conceive ought to be dealt with, not  
by means of a Private Bill, but by the  
Local Government Bill before the  
House at the present time. One of  
these objects relates to the contribu-  
tions of the City of Belfast for the  
maintenance of Reformatories and In-  
dustrial Schools. The City of Belfast  
at present contributes in this respect  
with the Counties of Down and Antrim.  
By the Local Government Bill the  
Corporation of Belfast will become an  
Urban County Council, and will acquire  
the fiscal powers now exercised by the  
Grand Juries of the counties. It  
is evident, therefore, that the pur-  
pose intended by this portion of  
the Bill will be more effectually  
attained under the general law, and  
this portion of the Bill ought not to be  
entertained by the House. But my  
main objection to the Bill concerns the  
Lunatic Asylum at Belfast, and the  
extent of the asylum district. At  
present the Antrim district is included  
with the City of Belfast, and the asylum  
is governed by a Board of Governors,  
nominated partly by the local contri-  
butors and partly by the Lord Lieut-  
enant. Some time ago the Board of  
Control, a State Department instituted  
by Parliament for the government of  
Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, agreed to  
the erection of a second lunatic asylum  
in the County of Antrim, to meet the  
requirements for further accommoda-  
tion; and for convenience and the  
health of patients it was arranged that  
transfers should be made from the one  
to the other. The Board of Governors  
of the existing asylum at first approved  
of the project, and the promoters of  
this Bill have circulated a statement  
for the information of the House, which  
I cannot but characterise as extremely  
misleading, and one which, in my ex-  
perience, is unprecedented in its  
recklessness; for they state that the

Board of Governors are in favour of this scheme, whereas the fact is, that although the Board of Governors a long time since—I think in 1890—at a small meeting passed what may be described as a snatch resolution in favour of a scheme of which they had not then had a clear view, this statement entirely suppresses the fact that within the last few weeks the existing Board passed a resolution adverse to the scheme. I see no Representative of the Irish Government present, or I should like to ask for an explanation of what effect was produced on the mind of the Lord Lieutenant by this change of mind on the part of the Board of Governors. Does the Lord Lieutenant think, does the Board of Control think, that this is a scheme that ought to be carried out? The intention of Parliament, by the Lunatic Asylums Act, manifestly and indisputably was, that changes of this kind should be carried out, if at all, under the authority of the public law by the constituted Department, and not by means of a Private Bill. What is the proposal? The proposal is, not that there shall be two asylums in one district governed by one Board, but that there shall be two Boards constituted for separate management, although it is intended that patients may be transferred from the one to the other. Upon this I may say at once, that to institute two Boards for the two asylums will mean that both the County of Antrim and the City of Belfast will be heavily mulcted. Two staffs of high officials, two staffs of assistants, two sets of contractors, with the certainty that higher prices will be paid for two sets of supplies purchased in smaller quantities, two sets of advertisements, and two sets of machinery for the transaction of business generally. On its merits, I say the scheme is one that the House ought not to entertain. But I do not lean most upon that. I rely on the principle that Parliament by Public Statute has created a Department for dealing with questions of this class, and if circumstances require that these matters should be revised or reviewed, then that should be done by Public Act, and not by means of a Private Bill. The Lord Lieutenant and the Board of Control have power

*Mr. Sexton*

to separate, extend, contract, or alter any County Lunatic Asylum District, and they have so separated the Counties of Down and Antrim. I am told that the Lord Lieutenant cannot separate a city from a county, and, if so, it is manifest, I think, that if a difficulty present itself in this respect it should not be solved by a Private Bill; and, since we have a Local Government Bill before Parliament, why not insert, as a matter of general law, a provision which shall give the Lord Lieutenant power to separate a city from a county? This Bill proposes that the City of Belfast shall be a district in itself—an unprecedented proposition; there is nothing of the kind in Ireland—and that control shall be vested in the Corporation. Now, I fail to discover any argument why an institution supported in one moiety of the cost by the State should be vested in a Local Body. It is proposed to give the Corporation absolute control of the asylum, and on that I have to make two remarks. In the first place, as I have said before in the House, though it led to no practical result, that although one-third of the population of Belfast is Catholic, some three or four score thousands, such has been the jerrymandering of the wards in past times—some 50 years since, when Belfast was a small place—that Catholics are unable to return a single member to the Corporation. There are 80,000 Catholics in the town, yet out of 40 members of the Corporation there is not a solitary Catholic. Now, the proposal is that in regard to the Governing Body of this asylum, in which Catholics have so much interest, the Corporation shall have the power to nominate 12 of the 18 Governors, giving them simply absolute control, and this is in direct contravention of Clause 15 of the Local Government Bill, which provides that the Lord Lieutenant shall nominate half of the Governing Body, upon the principle that as the funds are provided in moieties the representation shall be equal. But the Corporation of Belfast, ignoring this rule, wish to appropriate two-thirds of the representation. It is evident, I think, that the House cannot for a moment entertain the idea of giving

extension of power to a  
by means of a Private Bill,  
travention of a Bill by which  
ment propose to establish  
rule of law in regard to a  
nt Department. I say, also,

be intended that patients  
transferred from the one to  
for the sake of their health,  
not expedient to have two  
f Governors subject to the  
of establishing two asylums  
unity. The establishment of  
ls will certainly not contribute  
mony of management. There  
e Bill elaborate, I may say  
s, provisions for the settle-  
isputes between the Board of  
s in Belfast and in the county,  
accommodation of patients,  
arges to be made. I must  
institution of two Boards  
ls bring with it a conflict of

I submit, that if the public  
spect to the administration  
o be amended, as to which no  
been shown, this should be  
ublic enactment, and not by  
Bill for one city. I submit,  
there are matters of account  
gements to be adjusted in  
ns between the city and the  
nsequent upon Belfast being  
d an Urban County Council ;  
y, I submit it is extremely  
ant and inexpedient that the

Commons should promote  
ptional, piecemeal legislation  
to one city on a question  
g as it does the whole nation,  
 unquestionably a matter of  
v. If the House entertain

sition and, still more, if it be  
o law, what will be the effect  
cal Government Bill? That  
overloaded with Amendments  
particular legislation for every  
Ireland. We shall have to  
a Amendment in respect to the  
ublin, vesting the asylum there  
orporation of that city, and

Corporation of that city two-  
erepresentation on the Govern-  
and providing for two asylums ;  
have to present Amendments  
eration of the various districts  
., and for the increase of the  
he local contributory bodies.  
of principle, and in point of

expediency, the House should de-  
cline to entertain, in a Private  
Bill, these proposals touching a  
matter of public law. Therefore,  
I ask the right hon. Gentleman who  
now represents the Government (Mr.  
Ritchie), and in whom I have every  
confidence, though this is a matter  
more concerning the Irish Minister, to  
assent to the proposal I make, that the  
Bill should either be rejected to-day,  
or that, at any rate, it should be post-  
poned until the mind of Parliament is  
ascertained in regard to the principle,  
and even the details, of the Local Govern-  
ment Bill. If the Bill is now persisted  
with, we must meet it with determined  
opposition at every stage.

\*(3.25.) SIR EDWARD HARLAND  
(Belfast, N.): I quite hoped that the hon.  
Member for West Belfast would have  
given us hearty support rather than  
have put opposition in the way of the  
Bill, though I am glad he has adopted  
the latter course in a rather mild, and  
I may say rather a good-hearted spirit.  
It is well known in the neighbourhood  
of Belfast that such has been the rapid  
and enormous growth of the city that  
the Lunatic Asylum which has served for  
all the patients in Belfast and Antrim  
has become totally unfit for its purposes ;  
and when I had the honour of a seat  
as one of the Governors, three or four  
years ago, the question was continually  
before the Board of Governors, and the  
point was raised how the Asylum could  
be enlarged and made suitable for the  
increasing requirements. Structural  
enlargement was deemed impossible,  
and at that time it was deter-  
mined that the building should  
be offered for sale to the War  
Office, to be used as a barrack. This  
will give an idea of the extent to which  
the Governors had at that time gone  
towards the conclusion that the  
building was quite unfitted for its  
purpose. Since then Belfast has still  
more rapidly increased, until at last it  
has been found impossible to arrange  
matters so as to accommodate the whole  
of the patients from Belfast and  
Antrim, many of whom have had to be  
sent to Ballymena and other unions  
in Down and Antrim. The necessity  
for an extension of the asylum having  
been shown, very grave consideration  
was given to the problem, and in the

result we have this Bill, which we submit to the House for Second Reading. The objections the hon. Member has raised should be looked upon rather as minor points which can readily be adjusted by a Committee upstairs, should the House give the Bill a Second Reading. Since the Bill was printed we have had before us the Local Government Bill, some of the minor clauses of which would undoubtedly to some extent affect this Bill, but the promoters, the Corporation of Belfast, are perfectly willing on these points to alter the Bill in Committee. But what we broadly urge on the consideration of the House is that, the necessity for some such change being shown, we were bound to carry it through, and with the object of getting authority for the transfer we submit our proposals to the House. Further, I say the Board of Control in Dublin, having had the matter thoroughly laid before them, came to the conclusion that this was the best course to take, expressed regret that they had not the power to carry it through, and urged proceeding with a Private Bill. County Antrim will erect an asylum for county patients, and the present building will be sold to the Corporation.

MR. SEXTON: Will the hon. Gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Has the mind of the Lord Lieutenant and has the opinion of the Board of Control been ascertained since the Board of Governors rescinded their resolution in favour of the scheme?

\*SIR E. HARLAND: With reference to that, I may say distinctly that the Board of Governors came to a definite and decisive resolution in the year 1890 to make this transfer; the Grand Jury of County Antrim approved and raised no objection to it, and it is only within the last two or three weeks that the Board of Governors again reviewed the matter, and it seems to me that it is an unbusiness-like proceeding to raise objections at the last moment, when the Bill had been entered upon, and it was ascertained that the Grand Jury of Antrim raised no objection, and when the points of difference can be adjusted after consideration of all interests by the Committee upstairs. All this was shown to the County Authorities; they

waived their objections on minor points, and the County Members are here to support the Second Reading of the Bill, if necessary. It can be shown, I think, that the supposed rescinding of the resolution was a momentary thought, and should not stand in the way of a large transaction of this kind, to which serious consideration has been given for years. If at the last moment a momentary change of opinion should be allowed such weight as to change a course of policy deliberately entered upon, what progress can be made in any important public undertaking? The promoters of this Bill are business men; they have come after serious consideration to the opinion that this change is necessary, and I beg the House to view the proposal of the Belfast Corporation in a favourable light by giving the Bill a Second Reading, leaving points of detail to be fairly and fully discussed before a Committee.

\*(3.29.) SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (Monaghan, S.): The hon. Baronet has not in the slightest degree removed the main objection—that being, that principle and expediency are opposed to such an attempt to deal piecemeal with Local Government administration in one of its most important details, the management of lunatic asylums. The hon. Member for West Belfast has so forcibly, and lucidly, and so unanswerably stated the objections, that I certainly will not attempt to go over them again. I appeal to the Chief Secretary not to allow this Bill to pass, for it conflicts with certain principles in the Local Government Bill for Ireland introduced by the Leader of the House within the last few days. I shall give my most emphatic opposition to the Bill in the shape in which it now appears, and I am sure that if it passes it will be the cause of many objections and amendments being raised to the Local Government Bill.

(3.30.) MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I do not think there is any dispute as to the necessity for making provision for lunatics in the district. The hon. Member for West Belfast has objected to details in the Bill.

*Sir Edward Harland*

**MR. SEXTON:** The establishment of a second asylum has nothing to do with the Bill, that is determined; the main point is, the division of the governorship of the two asylums.

**MR. MACARTNEY:** One of the objections of the hon. Member was on the score of expense; but I think he must see that if two asylums are established it is impossible that the same staff can do duty in both. The Governors are unpaid, so that the establishment of two Boards will add nothing to the expenses imposed on county or city. Then the hon. Member objected to the clause dealing with the transfer of patients. Now, I am not so locally connected with the city as with the county; but I have authority from the promoters to say that this clause was introduced at the direct suggestion of the Board of Control.

**MR. SEXTON:** The hon. Member entirely misapprehends me. I do not object to the transfers. I approve of them, they are excellent; but I object to having the control of these transfers of patients under two Boards of Governors.

**MR. MACARTNEY:** I am dealing with the hon. Member's objections generally, and I wish to explain that this clause did not originate in any deep design or sinister intention of the Corporation of Belfast; but it was introduced at the instigation of the Board of Control. The Board of Control is responsible for this suggestion in the Bill. Then as to the vesting the asylum in the Corporation, where again I think the hon. Member raised an objection. I have authority to say that the promoters will consent to any clause that the Board of Control desire should be introduced. They do not wish to depart from any clause, they will accept anything the Board of Control think it is necessary to insert. On the general question as to the desirability of delaying this Bill until the passing of the Local Government Bill, I think it is hardly reasonable to ask this from the promoters, the necessity for a Bill of that kind being admitted. If I understand the attitude taken up by the hon. Member and his friends, the passing of the Local Government Bill may not possibly become an accomplished fact within the present

Session; and the necessity for dealing with this question being admitted, I hardly think the House will object to the Second Reading. But all the objections of the hon. Member go to the clauses, and on these points of objection the promoters are ready and willing to accept suggestions which may be made by the Board of Control before the Committee upstairs.

(3.35.) **MR. T. M. HEALY** (Longford, N.): I did not hear with any satisfaction the declaration from the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir. E. Harland) that this Bill has been drawn by business men. Now, if there is anything I abhor in relation to matters of this kind it is an arrangement entered into by business men, for there is almost sure to be some attempt at fraud at the bottom of it, some attempt to take an advantage of somebody. It is part of the system of business men in these business-like arguments on which they plume themselves upon having a superiority over the rest of creation. I have the most profound distrust of the talk about the arrangements of business men. My hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) has taken an attitude which entitles him to the gratitude of the House, and especially of Her Majesty's Government. He has hit the blot in the Bill, and I am amazed that the Irish Secretary should have thought this Bill of so little importance that, until he was urgently sent for by the President of the Local Government Board, he did not think it worth his while to attend this discussion. This business arrangement on the part of the Corporation of Belfast is an attempt to contravene the general law; but contrast the action of Her Majesty's Government with that taken towards the Municipal Franchise Bill which we introduced a week ago. What did the First Lord of the Treasury say no later than Wednesday last week? "We cannot have your Bill," said he, "because it is in contravention of our splendid Local Government scheme," the boon he proposes to cram down our throats. But here, as my hon. Friend has said, is a direct attempt to contravene your Local Government Bill, an attempt by Belfast to secure for itself a specific legislative enactment

and facilities above all the rest of that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland. Dublin, Kilkenny, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, all the rest of the Corporations of Ireland, are to be subject to the general law, all but Belfast, because Belfast happens to be a centre of that "loyal" minority where so much harmony exists, except on the 12th July, and is to have special legislation.

MR. MACARTNEY: Will the hon. and learned Member allow me to say that, as I have stated, the Corporation are quite willing to drop the exceptional clauses.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then there remains no necessity for the Bill. The Local Government Bill can be availed of much more cheaply and without the expenses of counsel, who, I understand, get very fine fees for their arguments upstairs. It can be done more cheaply and expeditiously without the expenses of counsel and solicitors, who benefit so largely from this Private Bill legislation. I am amazed that the Chairman of Committees does not interpose with opposition to this Bill. He had hardly been a week in his office when he took part against us for altering the franchise in a Private Bill. In 1885 Sir Charles Dilke put a Franchise Amendment into the Rathmines Bill. We the following year tried to follow that up, but the Chairman of Committees got our proposal rejected, and the borough franchise has remained ever since. What is this but to alter the franchise and derogate from the general law? Here is the general law of Local Government, that the Lord Lieutenant shall have half the power of nomination. Why does not the Chairman of Committees, why does not the Leader of the House, intervene and say, "You must not alter the franchise simply for the erection of another Board of Governors?" What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. From our point of view, why should not the Corporations of Clonmel or Waterford have similar powers? Where is the keen anxiety of the Chairman of Committees with regard to the alteration of the franchise, when this very week we have had before us a scheme of Local Government, in which dealing with this very question of lunatics is included? The

Government were willing that this Bill should pass *sub silentio*, and but for the vigilance of my hon. Friend this might have been done. I do not interest myself with proposals dealing with lunatic asylums, especially when they are contained in Private Bills; but here the Government were willing to acquiesce in a proposal in a Private Bill to derogate from the general law as embodied in their own Bill. Fortunately my hon. Friend read the Bill, and was here to challenge it, while the Irish Secretary stayed out of the House until he was twice urgently sent for.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Did the right hon. Gentleman hear one word of the statement of my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast?

MR. JACKSON: No; I did not, because I was in attendance upon a deputation, and unable to be present here; but I hurried to my place as soon as I was able to do so.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Very good. Accepting that in full, what was the duty of the Representatives of the Government who were present? Why did not the President of the Local Government Board get up and say, on behalf of the Government, that this was an attempt to derogate from the general law, and that it must be postponed until the Chief Secretary could be in his place? Why was not some action of the kind taken? No, but for the vigilance of my hon. Friend, the Bill would have slipped through, because of this arrangement with business men, to whom the hon. Baronet (Sir E. Harland) has alluded. We have business men on this side of the House. The whole question can be dealt with just as well in the Local Government Bill as it can be in the Bill now before us. I say it can be much better dealt with. Of course, we may be asked, "How on earth does the question of Protestant and Catholic come in on the question of the management of lunatic asylums?" We say we are entitled to a fair proportion of the representation on the Local Bodies, and this, owing to your jerry-mandering of the wards in past years,

Mr. T. M. Healy

are now unable to obtain. It often seems that some of the unfortunate inmates of these asylums have their eyes restored towards the close of the day, and we say at these moments the consolation of religion should be offered to them. We are entitled to have more than a third of the representation, but we have not a single representative on the Board of Control; we have not one representative on the Corporation; we cannot even have a Catholic scavenger in Belfast—there is not a Catholic employé of the Corporation of Belfast, from town clerk to scavenger. My hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) represents a third of the population of Belfast, and to say that he is not to be heard by the Chief Secretary upon this Bill, because the right hon. Gentleman is attending a deputation, and that the Bill cannot be postponed, is a little too much. I think the time has now come for the Government to be heard. They have their Bill, and if they believe in the uses of that Bill for healing the woes of Ireland, let it have equal application in Belfast. You may amend that Bill to include all these questions, and mainly the stand you have taken against the Municipal Franchise Bill is what we may fairly ask you to adopt in this Bill.

(41.) MR. JACKSON: The hon. learned Gentleman might have said a great deal of his warmth, but there is not the slightest foundation for any of the suggestions and insinuations he has thrown in regard to my absence from the earlier part of this Debate. It is gratifying to me, as one of those interested in the Irish Local Government Bill, to find, from expressions of the hon. and learned Member has used, that he has a deep conviction that the Local Government Bill is going to pass this Session.

MR. T. M. HEALY: With your authority and the Closure.

MR. JACKSON: And, therefore, the decision of this asylum will not be unduly delayed to any great extent, even though this Bill should be rejected. Now, I want just to make my position, so far as the organization of this Bill is concerned. I have there was, long prior to any

knowledge on the part of the Local Authorities of what the Local Government Bill would contain, a general opinion that such proposals as these were necessary. There is no connection between the introduction of this Bill of the City of Belfast and the Local Government Bill, as the hon. Member implies there is. This question has been before the Board of Control on many previous occasions, and it is, I believe, admitted on all hands that there is a necessity for some more adequate accommodation for the insane. That everybody is agreed upon. Then the two Local Bodies have been in consultation and communication, and the question comes before the Government of Ireland in this form, their consent being necessary to enable the Local Authority, the City of Belfast, to promote this Bill. There was, I say, an agreement between the two Bodies—a general agreement—that further accommodation was necessary.

MR. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, am I not right in saying further accommodation has been provided for by order of the Department in Ireland and has nothing to do with this Bill?

\*MR. JACKSON: The insane, of course, had to be provided for; but no detailed provision was made in this manner. With regard to the Governing Body, I understand that both the hon. Member for West Belfast and the hon. Member for Longford complain that under the Bill the representation is not fair. As regards the clauses in this Bill which conflict with the Local Government Bill, the Irish Government, in due course, as soon as they saw the Bill, gave notice to the promoters that these clauses would have to be amended or omitted.

MR. SEXTON: What clauses?

\*MR. JACKSON: I am speaking of the clauses in this Private Bill now before us relating to the election of Governors, and to which, I understand, the hon. Member has made objection. In the promotion of the Bill the Government take no part; it is purely a local question, but it seems to me to be a reasonable attempt on the part of the City of Belfast to solve the difficulty and make the provision necessary. Before a Committee upstairs all objec-



tions can be urged, and upon the evidence before them it will be for the Committee to decide. So far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to vote against sending the Bill to a Committee to be dealt with.

(3.47.) MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I think the statement of the right hon. Gentleman is far from being satisfactory. Of course, we learn with pleasure that the right hon. Gentleman intends to insist that the clauses relating to the election of Governors are to be withdrawn. That we understand to be definitely settled. I must say that I am surprised that it ever entered into the heads of the promoters to insert these clauses. They appear to think that Belfast is entitled to be placed in a different position to any other community in Ireland. Why, this question of representation on the Board of Control is one upon which there has long been controversy between Irish Members and the Government. What is the position in the City of Cork? The Cork Corporation has not a single member representing it on the Board of Control for Cork Lunatic Asylum. Over and over again the Lord Lieutenant has refused, in a manner calculated to give the greatest offence to the great body of ratepayers in Cork, to permit the Corporation to elect a single member to the Board of Control for Cork Asylum, to the maintenance of which the citizens of Cork largely contribute. Cork being in this position, why is Belfast entitled to this privileged position? In a similar way, four or five years ago a municipal franchise was conferred on Belfast which was refused to the rest of Ireland. The doctrine seems to have gone forth that Belfast is entitled to an exceptional electoral position to which no other town can attain. Now, the right hon. Gentleman assumes that our opposition is based on the idea that the Local Government Bill is certain to pass this Session, but I beg to say that no such absurd hypothesis influences our action. But whether that Bill passes or not, this Bill is equally objectionable. If the Local Government Bill passes, then this Bill confers on Belfast electoral privileges in advance of the Local Government Bill, and if it does not pass the position

is worse, for then the City of Belfast, under this Bill, would have the right to elect two-thirds of the Governors of the local lunatic asylum, whereas other communities in Ireland would have no right to elect a single member. I should like to have a frank statement from the promoters; if the clauses relating to the election of Governors are dropped, is there any advantage in their Bill at all? What purpose will it serve? It is admitted that under the existing law provision can be made for the erection of an additional lunatic asylum. The only question, therefore, the Bill deals with, the only clauses which are necessary, the only clauses to change the law, are the clauses regulating the franchise, and if these are dropped, then surely that is the death warrant of the whole Bill, for no advantage will be conferred on Belfast, and no privilege that cannot be gained under the existing law. I presume there are some clauses for rating purposes, but that is all. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Maurice Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

(3.51.) MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to support the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend. I object equally to every part of this Bill. I object, in the first place, because I think the interests of the Counties of Down and Antrim have been neglected in the way the Bill has been prepared in favour of the clique who manage the municipal affairs of Belfast. As a ratepayer of County Down I personally object to the Bill. But I do not merely object on that ground, which would not be a sufficient ground for opposing the Second Reading of the Bill, inasmuch as it is a detail which could be treated in Committee. I object to the Bill, because it proposes to set up a religious tyranny over the Catholic minority in the City of Belfast. ("Oh, oh!") The hon. and gallant Member for North Down (Colonel Waring) expresses his horror at such an accusation being brought

*Mr. Jackson*

against his friends in that city; but I wonder why the hon. and gallant Gentleman and his friends in Belfast, instead of expressing horror when the accusation is made, do not use their influence with the promoters of this Bill to introduce a certain amount of tolerance towards that minority in regard to the management of the municipal affairs of that city. At the present moment, as I had occasion to remark in discussing another Bill the other night, there is not a single elected Poor Law Guardian, not a single member of the Town Council, not a single Harbour Commissioner in Belfast, who is a Catholic. There are 80,000 Catholics in Belfast who are absolutely refused any representation in the Local Bodies. I ask how, in the face of facts like these, the House can suppose to hand over to a body of this exclusive character the right to control matters which affect in the very closest degree the religion of the people? Of course, hon. Members may say, "What do the lunatics care about religion?" But I think anybody who has any knowledge of the treatment of the insane will admit that though men are in a lunatic asylum they may none the less, but rather the more, require the consolations of religion to soothe them in their terrible disorders. I say a lunatic, just as much as a sane man, can be made the subject of religious tyranny. This is not an imaginary danger. For years the Poor Law Guardians in Belfast persistently refused to increase by one farthing the miserable pittance paid to the Catholic chaplain for his ministrations to the Catholic poor in the workhouse, and out of 60 nurses in the workhouse they have only one who is a Catholic. They refused, I say, to increase the miserable pittance paid to the Catholic chaplain, and the Local Government Board had to interfere, and got his salary doubled. But the Local Government Board cannot interfere in these matters if this Bill passes; the Board will have no power to interfere to insure common and decent fairness in the treatment of the people of Belfast. Not merely does this danger exist in reference to lunatics; there are other clauses in the Bill to which I venture to draw attention. There is a

clause which proposes to transfer to the Corporation of Belfast all powers in connection with Industrial Schools and Reformatories. Now, everybody knows that Industrial Schools and Reformatories are religious institutions; they are attached to different denominations and controlled and administered by ministers of different denominations; therefore, in this respect, almost more than in any other department, there is danger of religious tyranny, and this I can show from experience of the county I represent. Cavan is a Catholic county, but the Grand Jury is Protestant. For 16 years in succession, and in spite of continual protests, the Grand Jury of the County of Cavan gave grants to Protestant Industrial Schools and refused to pay a farthing to Catholic Industrial Schools out of the money contributed mainly by Catholic ratepayers. I leave the hon. Member for South Tyrone and others, who abuse the Catholics of Ireland and say they are not fit for self-government on account of their tendencies towards religious persecution, to deal with facts like these. As a Protestant I say, and I deplore it with sincere regret, that the Corporation of Belfast cannot be trusted to give fair play to those members of the Catholic religion who are seeking under unexampled difficulties to bring up young persons of their own faith in Industrial Schools to lead better lives than their fathers did before them. I ask Members of this House, Conservative and Liberal, to pause before they set up an engine of religious persecution, which will be done if this Bill is passed. I hope this Motion of my hon. Friend will have support from both sides of the House. Of course there is one compromise open, if hon. Members who promote this Bill will assent to a redistribution of the wards at Belfast so as to arrive at a fair arrangement by which there may be Catholic representation upon the Town Council. In that way a compromise might be possible. In the Municipal Corporations Act for England there is a provision for the periodical revision of wards, and the Home Secretary, in whose Department the matter is controlled, knows that the power is frequently used in England. In Ireland there is no such power: the

wards of Belfast can only be altered by a Public or Private Act of Parliament. It would be possible to make such a compromise in the Bill and prevent the Bill becoming an engine of persecution against the religious minority in Belfast. I ask the House to pause before it sets up an engine of persecution, as would be done by the Bill. It would be in the interests of religion to throw out the Bill.

(4.3.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I regret the opposition of hon. Members below the Gangway. I cannot help thinking that if this Bill had been promoted by any other body than the Corporation of Belfast it would have been treated in an entirely different manner. The complaint is, that under this Bill there will be a chance of the Roman Catholic community of Belfast being unfairly dealt with. This is the head and front of the charge that is made against the Corporation of Belfast in this matter. The complaint is that the Catholics of Belfast have no representation on the Corporation. There is household suffrage in Belfast, and the reason why the Roman Catholics are not represented on the Corporation is that the minority are not strong enough to secure representation. The cumulative vote would have secured Catholic representation on the Corporation, but when the Local Government Bill which sought to confer that privilege was before the House, no one opposed it more strongly than the hon. Member for West Belfast.

MR. SEXTON: There was a difference proposed to be made between the counties.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The hon. Member opposed the cumulative vote. This is a Private Bill promoted by the Corporation of Belfast, and I do not see why it should not receive the same treatment as any English town would receive. The Bill is right in principle, and hon. Members cannot pretend that it is not. Therefore, if it is a right Bill it should be sent to be dealt with by a Committee dealing with Private Bills, where anything that may be wrong can be rectified.

(4.10.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I rise merely to ask one question, and my view of the

matter will be determined by the answer to it. I understand that there are certain clauses in the Bill to which objection is taken by hon. Members well acquainted with the locality. I understand that these clauses have been withdrawn, and I hear from hon. Members below the Gangway that if this is so there will be no necessity for the Bill at all. If these clauses are withdrawn, and if the residuum of the Bill is not necessary or operative for any useful purpose, why should not the discussion cease and the Bill be dismissed? Why should we go into the differences that exist between the religious bodies of Belfast? There has been a good deal of time unprofitably spent, but if we can come to some understanding as to what remains in the Bill which makes it worth while to pass it when these clauses have been withdrawn it will be very desirable.

\*(4.12.) MR. JACKSON: I understand that as to Clause 4, which deals with the appointment of Governors to the asylum, the Corporation have expressed their willingness to either withdraw it or to amend it in Committee in accordance with the wishes of the Committee. When the Bill came before the Irish Office, notice was given to the Corporation that the clause in question could not be allowed to pass in its present form, as it would conflict with the Local Government Bill. The clause merely deals with the nomination of Governors of asylums, and is only a matter of detail to which objection has been taken by the hon. Member for West Belfast. The clause seems to me to be perfectly capable of being made to deal fairly with the nomination of Governors proposed in the Bill. The other portions of the Bill deal with the main question, which is that of the financial adjustment between the City of Belfast and the county of Antrim, and the removal of patients from one to the other. It is quite open to Dublin or any other city to promote a similar Bill.

(4.14.) MR. SEXTON: I think the right hon. Gentleman's knowledge of the Bill must be very recent. I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman has looked at Clause 9? That clause proposes to give certain powers to the Corporation in respect of the

*Mr. Knox*

ation of industrial schools, and the subject is to be dealt with under provisions of the Local Government Bill. We desire that Belfast should be treated like the rest of the country, but we do not think that it should occupy the time of the House when the House is about to consider a Bill which deals with the whole question.

I never expected that the extension of household suffrage would give Roman Catholics a representation on the Corporation, or that any franchise would be equal. The city was divided into five wards 50 years ago, when the population was 70,000. No division has been made since then, although the population at the present time is 280,000. The Roman Catholic population has been deprived of all representation, because they have been divided into certain parts of the city. If the Bill will be withdrawn or postponed until we see what Parliament does with the Local Government Bill, I shall oppose the Bill to the extent unless the promoters agree to an instruction to the Committee to divide the city so as to give the Roman Catholics some representation on the Corporation. If no such representation is given, and if the Bill is read a second time, I will move that it be referred to a Select Committee, with special powers to divide Belfast in such a manner as to give the Roman Catholics the representation they desire.

I shall oppose the Bill to the extent unless the promoters agree to an instruction to the Committee to divide the city so as to give the Roman Catholics some representation on the Corporation. If no such representation is given, and if the Bill is read a second time, I will move that it be referred to a Select Committee, with special powers to divide Belfast in such a manner as to give the Roman Catholics the representation they desire.

17.) MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Devon): Any appeal based on a wish to secure the better representation of the Irish will be received by me with a favourable ear. The question, however, before the House does not turn on such considerations. The House, I think, is in rather an awkward position.

Belfast is proposing a Private Bill, and the Government are proposing a Public Bill, and if the latter becomes law, much of the advantages proposed in the Private Bill will become unnecessary. The practical question is, whether Belfast, having presented a Private Bill to the House, shall be prevented from going on because the Government have proposed a Public Bill which deals with the same subject? There are always uncertainties with regard to Belfast, but I confess I do not see any reason for destroying the

ordinary right of Belfast to go on as it proposes to do with a Private Bill. The hon. and learned Member for Longford, in a vein which is common with him, made a speech full of sound and fury, in which he confused two things—the introduction of a Private Bill which is at variance with public law, and the concurrent introduction of a public and private measure which are at variance with one another. The public proposal does not take away the ordinary right of Belfast to go on with their Bill. We have had a good deal of declamation—partly deserved, no doubt—about the bigotry of the Corporation of Belfast, but with respect to the 9th clause it is to be remarked that the commencement runs thus—

“From and after the passing of this Act the Council of the city shall have the same powers that are conferred upon the Town Councils of the boroughs of Dublin, Cork, and Limerick.”

MR. SEXTON: By Public Acts.

MR. COURTNEY: That does not affect the question. The real question which deserves consideration at this stage is as to the management of the lunatics. The lunatics of Antrim are going to be separated from those of Belfast. In the interests of the lunatics this may be doubtful equity. This is, however, a question which we cannot decide here, but which may be inquired into by a Select Committee upstairs. The hon. Member for West Belfast wishes that the Bill should be referred to a Hybrid Committee, but I see no reason why it should not take its ordinary course of being read a second time and then referred to such a Committee.

(4.23.) MR. T. M. HEALY: The right hon. Gentleman says that I have made a speech full of sound and fury, but I think he has made one of sound and ignorance. The Bill is a departure from the invariable law which Ireland enjoys. The Chairman of Committees has asked us to support the Bill and allow it to proceed in the ordinary way, but I do not see any good reason he has given for us to adopt that course. The fact that the Government are willing to allow special provisions to be passed for Belfast, and different from those contained in the Local Government Bill, shows that they neither expect nor

wish their own Bill to pass. If the Local Government Bill is to be proceeded with, why should the Belfast Bill be proceeded with? There is not a clause in this Bill which cannot be put in the Local Government Bill. If the Belfast Bill goes on, I shall move to insert in it the Assize or "Put-Me-in-the Dock Clause." I move that the Debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."  
—(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

Mr. SEXTON: Have we not a right to claim from the Government the ordinary courtesy of an expression of opinion? I think they should have time to consider my proposal that the Select Committee should be instructed to reconstruct the wards of the City. For that reason I support the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate.

\*Mr. JACKSON: The question of the re-construction of the wards of the City is one for the promoters of the Bill. The Government have taken no part in the matter. I said that, so far as I was concerned, I should vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, but that statement bound no one else but myself, and I did not, therefore, think there was any need for me to get up and say any more.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 137; Noes 149.—Div. List, No. 8.)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Debate resumed.

(4.45.) Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): One thing has been noticeable about this Debate, and that is that none of the Gentlemen who support this Bill have offered a single reason why it should be accepted by the House, or shown the slightest acquaintance with any of its clauses. The most interesting portion of the debate, however, was the reason offered by the Chief Secre-

tary why the Bill should pass. He stood up and with the greatest frankness said he thought it ought to pass, because, after all, it was doubtful whether the Local Government Bill would or would not pass.

Mr. JACKSON: I did not say that.

Mr. CHANCE: The right hon. Gentleman's words distinctly conveyed to the House the impression that he had some doubt in his own mind with regard to the Local Government Bill. It was interesting to note that the Gentleman who first repudiated that suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman was the Chairman of Ways and Means, who said the true reason why the Bill should pass was that as a Bill dealing with some of the points had been introduced by the Government, a Private Bill should be brought in *pari passu*. The position of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be that a change of the general law was improper in a Private Bill, but he distinguished this case because there was a Public Bill before the House. When he was dealing with the Belfast Main Drainage Bill of 1885, he took exception to the introduction of a Franchise Clause in a Private Bill. I am afraid I fail to find what sound and practical ground exists for the exceedingly subtle distinction in the case of the present Bill. The first question is, what case has been made out for the passage of this admittedly exceptional Bill? The right hon. Gentleman thought it his duty to support the Bill, and argued that it was necessary to provide the necessary extra accommodation for the lunatics of Belfast, and that in some way such accommodation would not exist unless the Bill were passed. In the Preamble of the Bill, so far from that point being taken, it said that an Order had been duly made authorising the erection of additional asylums in the City. The Bill would not in any way facilitate the provision of such accommodation. The Bill resolves itself into two distinct provisions—the franchise branch and the financial branch. I do not intend to labour the franchise portion of the Bill, as the Chief Secretary admitted that the Franchise Clause is bad in principle, and said that it was to be withdrawn, and then modified that by saying it would be amended.

Mr. T. M. Healy

**MR. JACKSON:** I said distinctly amended."

**MR. CHANCE:** Surely the Government, who properly object to this clause, ought to tell us before they ask us to assent to the Bill how they desire or expect the clause to be amended. I do not suppose the right hon. Gentleman has formed an opinion on the subject himself as yet.

**MR. JACKSON:** I have done so.

**MR. CHANCE:** Then I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to inform the House what that opinion is. As to the other division of the Bill, we are in the position that not a particle of reason has been alleged by the financial relations at present existing in respect to the accommodation of the lunatics of Belfast should be interfered with. The preamble carefully avoids any statement that the present financial relations on that subject are unjust or oppressive, or that any change is necessary or proper. We have not had a iota of information on the reason why the Government has consented to the division of this district into two. I oppose it on the ground that it will increase the public burdens on the people of Belfast. You will have two Asylums Boards and two distinct sets of officers, half of whom might be idle for a great part of their time instead of being transferred to the other asylum. The right hon. Gentleman seems to have overlooked the fact that as soon as this Bill was published it was repudiated by the Board of Governors of the present asylum, who are best informed in the matter, and they are prepared to undertake the government of the whole district, and did not desire two sets of offices and officials. In spite of that the House is asked to pass a Private Bill to make an alteration of the general law which the local authorities in Belfast have declared to be unnecessary and extravagant. The Bill proposes to create a body unique in the country, but its object appears to be to enable Belfast to escape the Local Government Bill, which its three Members following the Government are pledged by their party ties to support against their convictions.

**\* (4.56.) COLONEL WARING (Down, N.):** In my opinion this Debate has gone on long enough, and if hon. Members opposite think so I will sit down. The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken said there would be two sets of officers. As the two asylums are 20 miles apart it is obvious that there must be.

**MR. CHANCE:** That was my argument for having one instead of two asylums.

**COLONEL WARING:** But the ground is purchased and the arrangements made for the erection of the second asylum. Is that money to be thrown away? I hardly think that hon. Gentlemen opposite, with their love for economy, would urge that course being taken. The only body it creates which could possibly be dispensed with is the Board of Management, which, however costs nothing. I cannot see what possible reason there can be against the arrangement proposed. I should not have risen but that I was challenged with having neglected the interests of my constituents. Their interests will be looked after by the Committee upstairs, and it is perfectly unnecessary for the details to be discussed in this House. We have been told that Belfast should not be differently treated from other towns in Ireland, but Belfast has placed itself in a different position, and I cannot imagine that the matter is worthy of long discussion, or that the business of the House should be so delayed for an hour and a-half. These proposals do not throw any responsibility or charge upon the Roman Catholics of Belfast, and I am surprised that those statements should be made, that we desire to do anything exceptional in regard to that class of the community. From the remarks of the hon. Member for Cavan, it would appear that the Roman Catholics were trying to bring up their children in reformatory schools. I have no doubt very many of them are very likely to qualify their children for these reformatory schools, and the words are not mine, but those of the hon. Member for Cavan. I must say that had it not been mentioned, such a question is the last I should have introduced. I do sincerely think that the House will be well advised if it will persist in getting to a Division upon

this matter at once, and so allow the House to proceed with the Public Business, which is of considerable importance.

(5.5.) MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I cannot understand the hon. Member opposite in his suggestion that there has been a too prolonged Debate, or that waste of time could reasonably be charged against us. The facts, it seems to me, are quite the other way, and the last speaker—

COLONEL WARING: I said that I would sit down if you would take the Division, and as I sat down I asked you to take the Division.

MR. DILLON: I must say, upon my part, and upon the part of those upon these Benches, that we have no desire that a Division should not be taken now, and that I believe the discussion is being carried on for no useful purpose. What seems to me is that the House of Commons is just now engaged in the purest waste of time in carrying on an attempt which ought not to be carried on, and which simply results in nothing but pure waste of Public Business. The Home Secretary seems to be so absolutely indifferent to the convenience of the Members of this House and to the progress of Public Business, that he is just now, I presume, sauntering about some of the rooms of the House; while he saunters into this House and out again, leaving the House unadvised as to its proceedings. We have heard in the course of this Debate no word as to what the course of the Government will be. We are told that the Government are indifferent as to whether this Bill is passed or not. But while that was the statement made by the Minister left to take charge of the conduct of affairs in the House, we have discovered that the two wings were covertly engaged in treating this Division as a Government Division. Are the Government absolutely indifferent to the Business in this House; and, if not, would it not be manifestly for the interest of Public Business, and for the interest of the Government themselves, if they would consent to adjourn this Debate until the general views of the Members on this side of the House and the Members interested in this Bill are more fully ascertained? One thing I think is

*Colonel Waring*

abundantly manifest, that progress with this Bill will not be facilitated by continued discussion; and therefore I do not propose to occupy the time of the House in replying to the argument of the hon. Member for Down, who complains about the waste of time, as if he would prevent all other Members from taking part in the Debate.

(5.10.) MR. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I would wish to point out, in connection with this Bill, that it relates to the expenditure of public money; money which the taxpayers contribute, and yet that money is left to the control of men who are absolutely devoid of any authority. These Grand Juries have so little authority, and their past performances have been so much defamed, that the Government themselves have condemned them, and let it be in the recollection of the House they are about to take over their fiscal authority. I ask the House to say, are we to hold that these men, to whom fiscal authority cannot be delegated, who are not worthy of it, are to have the uncontrolled expenditure of thousands of pounds? Why, there is not a man in the County Antrim, irrespective of religion, who would not have something to say in objection to it. There are thousands of people in Belfast, and thousands of people in the County Antrim, who have really nothing to say to the Grand Jury system, or to the management of the Grand Jury in the county. Over and over again I have heard County Antrim men and Belfast men complain that they have nothing to do with the Grand Jury system; with the Grand Jury who strike those rates they have no connection. The Grand Juries raise those rates, and expend them as they like, and no rate payer can interfere; while if any rate payer would interfere, his interference would be scouted as a piece of impudence. So thoroughly are these people imbued with the idea that they are all powerful, that a large amount of public jobbery consequently takes place, to the extent of a vast loss to the ratepayers themselves, arising from an expenditure in which the people themselves have no voice. I say it is monstrous to ask the House to enable, under these circumstances, a Grand Jury to expend the thousands of pounds, knowing as I do

ratepayer in the North of  
ws, that these men repre-  
; that they represent them-  
s, and that they represent  
by-the-way, exceedingly  
ct, there can be no doubt  
uestion of accommodation.  
w, while in prison, a large  
men brought in from  
o were chargeable to the  
trim; I saw them searched,  
ed, and measured; and  
t to know is why you can-  
same with your lunatics,  
removed from one county  
with convenience, the  
n which they came being  
their cost. If this matter  
works so exceedingly well  
prisoners, and under the  
e Prisons Board, and the  
ard says it works exceed-  
why should we not put it  
elsewhere? The fact of it  
Bill is, in a great measure,  
other Irish Bills that pass  
is House—it creates a  
of offices and devours the  
of the people. It reminds  
Bill passed for appointing  
of Explosives, and in one  
only man who sold ex-  
as the Inspector himself.  
laint has been made that  
ers occupy the time of the  
i purely local affairs. In  
t complaint, I say that you  
w us to manage our local  
me. [An hon. MEMBER: In  
nd supposing you do allow us,  
oubt we could do it a great  
than you can. I should  
terfered in this Debate but  
that I know the feeling of  
and I should be inclined to  
some observations made in  
of the Debate, that the ob-  
this Bill is not purely  
stion between Catholic and  
There are, as I know  
ands of Protestants in the  
reland who have no repre-  
hatever, whom this matter  
ly, and who yet are entirely  
om having a voice in the  
these affairs. I say that  
General Prisons Board can  
ir affairs so as to be satis-  
themselves, so the affairs

dealt with under this Bill could be  
managed, and I think the Bill should,  
therefore, be withdrawn.

\* (5.18.) MR. JACKSON: The hon.  
Member for Mayo and the hon. Mem-  
ber for West Belfast made a suggestion  
that this Bill should be referred to a  
Hybrid Committee. I would venture  
to say that there would be no objection  
to such a Motion if it were made, and  
I would suggest to hon. Members  
whether it would not be best to agree  
to a Second Reading of the Bill at  
once on the understanding that it will  
be referred to a Hybrid Committee.  
That will save the time of the House,  
and, I think, meet the views of the hon.  
Members opposite.

(5.20.) MR. T. M. HEALY: Speak-  
ing on behalf of my hon. Friends who  
sit beside me and for myself, I have to  
say that we are prepared to accept the  
right hon. Gentleman's suggestion, pro-  
vided that the Government will under-  
take that amongst the names suggested  
on behalf of the Government for the  
Hybrid Committee the name of my  
hon. Friend the Member for West Bel-  
fast should be one.

\*MR. JACKSON: The hon. Member  
must be aware that I have no power  
whatever to determine what the names  
on the Committee shall be. The  
Government do not desire to be re-  
sponsible in the matter; but so far  
as I am concerned, I must say that I  
should be glad to see the name of the  
hon. Member for West Belfast upon  
the Committee.

MR. DILLON: I understand that  
the Government will support the  
nomination of the hon. Member for  
West Belfast to the Committee.

MR. JACKSON: Yes; so far as I am  
concerned myself, I will support his  
nomination.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Bill be referred to a Hybrid Com-  
mittee of seven Members, and that the Com-  
mittee have power to appoint the hon. Member  
for West Belfast as one of the Members."—  
(*Mr. Chance.*)

MR. SPEAKER: The proper course  
is to wait until the Bill is committed.  
When the Bill is committed, it can then



be settled what proportion of Members shall constitute the Hybrid Committee.

MR. CHANCE: Very well, Sir; I withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**MERSEY AND IRWELL (PREVENTION OF POLLUTION) BILL.**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

(5.23.) SIR HENRY JAMES (Bury, Lancashire): I am sorry that I have to interfere in connection with this Bill. It is promoted by the Joint Committee of the County Councils of Lancashire and Cheshire for the purpose of preventing the pollution of the Rivers Mersey and Irwell; but I think it is open to grave objection, inasmuch as the Bill, while conferring powers upon the County Councils for the prevention of pollution of the rivers, also seeks to confer new and extensive powers without taking into account any of the safeguards which are in existence under the Public Act for the Protection of Manufacturers. This Bill seeks not only to enforce powers already existing, but it seeks to enforce new powers for the prevention of the pollution of rivers. That may be right or wrong, and I will not stop to discuss it; but it should not be done by means of a Private Bill. The Bill will throw a very great burden upon both the manufacturers and the ratepayers in the neighbourhood of those rivers, and I feel it due to my constituents to make a protest against the progress of it, believing as I do that, though I should like to carry its objects into effect, this is not the means of doing it.

\*(5.25.) THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): When the Bill first came under my notice, I thought that the provisions contained in it were of a serious character; so serious that I thought that, so far as I am concerned, it would

be quite impossible for me to recommend it to the House for Second Reading. In the first place, the Bill proposes to effect a very sweeping alteration in the law with regard to the pollution of rivers. But while I do not wish to lay down the general principle that in no case ought the law to be altered by means of a Private Bill, it seems to me that the provisions of this Bill are so strong and that the proposed alterations are so great that it goes beyond the proper limits. The main proposal in the Bill, and one to which I think serious objection may be taken, is that it sweeps away the whole protection given to manufacturers and others by the general law. The Central Board takes the best means in its power to prevent the pollution of rivers, and in manufacturing districts such protection as it is possible to give within reasonable limits is given by the Central Department. I informed the promoters of the Bill that if the protection given by the general law to manufacturers was swept away, the Local Government Board would oppose the Bill, but that they would forward its passing if the promoters would consent to retain the protection given under the general law by the provision which prevents proceedings from being taken until the consent of the Local Government Board has been obtained. I received an assurance from the promoters that they would assent to this course, and that a clause would be submitted to the Committee which would restore the protection given by the general law to the manufacturers. Still, even with the insertion of such a clause, I think objection may fairly be taken to the Bill in regard to its other provisions, although possibly not of so serious a nature; so that I should be disposed to recommend the House to allow the Bill to be read a second time in order that it may be put before a Select Committee. There is no doubt that the condition of these rivers is very bad, and I am sure all those interested would be very glad if they could by any means be rendered more pure. For these reasons I think the Bill might be sent to a Select Committee.

*Mr. Speaker*

) SIR WILLIAM HOULDS-  
I (Manchester, N.W.): I  
like to say a word or two in de-  
the action of the Joint Com-  
of the Counties of Lancashire  
eshire in promoting this Bill.  
d be recollected that the Joint  
tee represents some eight or  
unty boroughs, and also that  
specially charged, by order of  
al Government Board, to carry  
Rivers Pollution Act of 1876.  
een found perfectly impossible  
ne general law to carry out that  
h any effect, and they therefore  
as their duty to come to this  
und ask for powers which they  
to be absolutely necessary for  
ying out of the duties imposed  
em. In regard to the manu-  
s and others most affected they  
se how desirable it is that action  
be taken to carry into effect the  
. 1876, and I believe I am right  
ig that no objection on the part  
facturers is taken, although, no  
their interests ought to be, and  
protected. No doubt some of  
ho desire that protection will  
before the Committee, and there  
the protection they are en-  
o.

) MR. CHARLES SCHWANN  
ester, N.): In regard to the  
anal and the sewerage along the  
believe the health of the people  
to suffer unless some drastic  
is adopted. I believe this  
ll afford some remedy, and I  
upport the Motion for its Second  
3.

on agreed to.

read a second time, and com-

#### NEW WRIT.

Kirkcaldy District of Burghs, v.  
rge Campbell, deceased.—(*Mr.*  
*Morley.*)

#### QUESTIONS.

#### TELEGRAPHIC LINES TO THE CONTINENT.

HENNIKER HEATON (Can-  
): I beg to ask the Postmaster  
whether he is now able to give

I. [NEW SERIES.]

the House the amount of the receipts  
and expenditure, respectively, for a  
period of 12 months, in connection  
with the telegraphic lines to the  
Continent; and of the original total  
cost to the British Government in-  
curred on the acquisition of such lines?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL  
(Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester,  
N.E.): An account could be made  
of the receipts derived from foreign  
messages, but some part of them would  
be applicable to Inland service. The  
expenditure would be more difficult to  
define accurately, as the staff is largely  
employed also on Inland duties. It  
would be impossible to give the total  
cost to Her Majesty's Government of  
the acquisition of the submarine lines,  
inasmuch as the Dutch lines were not  
distinguished in the purchase of the  
whole system of the Electric and Inter-  
national Telegraph Company.

#### WRECKS ON THE GLAMORGAN- SHIRE COAST.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS  
(Glamorgan, S.): I beg to ask  
the President of the Board of  
Trade whether he is aware that the  
following shipwrecks have taken place  
on the Glamorganshire coast, between  
Sker Point and the Nash Lighthouse;  
the *James Gray* on the Tuskar Rock, on  
27th January, 1883, when 25 lives were  
lost; the *Mabel* on the Nash Sands, on  
23rd January, 1885, when eighteen lives  
were lost; the *Malleny* on the Tuskar  
Rock, on 15th October, 1886, when 20  
lives were lost; the *Berygloe* on the  
Nash Sands, on the same night, when  
one life was lost, and the rest of the  
crew narrowly escaped; the *Caterina*  
on the Nash Sands, on 16th January,  
1887, when 13 lives were lost; whether  
he is aware that on Saturday, the 6th  
inst., a telegram from Cardiff reached  
Porthcawl, stating that a brig was on  
the breakers west of the Nash buoy;  
that the Porthcawl lifeboat was out all  
night, but found no trace of the vessel,  
which is supposed to have foundered;  
and that, on Wednesday, the 9th inst.,  
a large brigantine was observed from  
Porthcawl to be on the Nash Sands,  
with signals of distress flying; and  
whether, in view of this loss of life and  
property, steps will be taken to provide  
telegraphic communication between the

3 G

Nash Lighthouse and Porthcawl; a rocket apparatus station between Nash and Porthcawl; alarm buoys on the Nash Sands; and to replace the refuge beacon on the Tuskar Rock, which was knocked down by a steamer?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am aware generally of the circumstances referred to by the hon. Member, but no intimation of a casualty on the 9th instant has yet reached me. The question of stationing a rocket apparatus between Nash and Porthcawl has been under consideration in the past, and I have directed an Inspector of the Board of Trade to make a further Report. The question of telegraphic communication between the Nash Lighthouse and Porthcawl must be considered as part of the general subject. A proposal for improving the lighting of the Bristol Channel in the vicinity of the Nash Sands will be included in the Trinity House Estimates of the year 1892-3.

#### EPSOM NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. R. WALLACE (Edinburgh, East): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that, a few days ago, certain children attending Epsom National Schools having had their attendances marked in the school books in the morning, were conducted to the Conservative Club and employed in addressing electioneering circulars for the Rev. E. W. Northey, the manager of the school, who is a candidate for the Surrey County Council, and that the same process was repeated with the afternoon attendance; and, in the event of such things having happened, if he will state whether he will take any and what steps in the matter?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): I am informed that ten boys were so employed without the knowledge of the manager, but although the said boys were, it is stated, beyond the age of compulsory attendance, and their attendances on that occasion were scrupulously cancelled, I cannot help thinking that in the circumstances a very injudicious act was committed,

*Mr. Arthur Williams*

and one that should not be repeated. I can do nothing more than convey this opinion to the manager.

#### EDINBURGH POST OFFICE.

MR. R. WALLACE (Edinburgh, East): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, with reference to the fact that an officer connected with the sorting department of the Edinburgh Post Office, who, after a service of 49 years, was retired at the end of last year, and was ten days afterwards permitted to resume his duty, if he will state the grounds on which such exceptional treatment was extended to this officer?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The retirement of the officer in question was not actually complete when it was found that he was not subject to the operation of the Order in Council of the 15th of August, 1890, and he has accordingly resumed duty.

#### OFFICIAL AUDITORS.

COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the County of Cumberland and elsewhere some of the official auditors have insisted upon divisional superintendents of police being made accounting officers, and to be therefore saddled with financial duties independently of the Joint Committee and in spite of the Local Authority; and whether this action has been taken by authority of the Local Government Board; and, in the contrary case, if directions will be issued establishing a uniform practice for auditors, and forbidding them to introduce changes in the system of police finance on their own initiative?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I have made inquiry as to the course taken by the auditor referred to. He informs me that in no instance has he insisted or even urged that the County Council should adopt an arrangement which could have the effect of making the police superintendents accounting officers. In the County of Cumberland, which is alluded to in the question, the cheques for police pay and contingent expenses,

ent by the county treasurer direct  
ie superintendents of the several  
ons, and this being the case it is  
tial that the divisional superin-  
nts should account to the auditor  
ie expenditure of the sums which  
thus been received and expended  
them. The Local Government  
d are not empowered to give any  
tions which would relieve the  
intendents from thus accounting  
onies sent to them direct by the  
ty treasurer for payment to other  
ns, nor would it be right that they  
ld do so, apart from any question  
ututory power. If the payments  
ade to the chief constable instead  
the divisional superintendents,  
the case in some counties, the  
constable would be required to  
nt for the monies thus received  
im, and, under ordinary circum-  
es, accounts by the divisional  
intendents would not be required.

#### WESTERN PACIFIC ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

R. COBB (Warwick, S.E.,  
y): I beg to ask the Under  
etary of State for the Colonies  
her, under the Western Pacific  
r in Council (1877), a British  
et can legally be tried and con-  
d by the Judicial Commissioner in  
without a jury, of murdering  
her British subject on board a  
sh vessel?

IE UNDER SECRETARY OF  
TE FOR THE COLONIES (Baron  
le WORMS, Liverpool, East Tox-  
): This question is a purely legal  
and ought to have been addressed  
y hon. and learned Friend the  
ney General. It appears to me,  
ver, to be clear from Section 6  
he Pacific Islanders' Protection  
1875, and Articles 7, 18, 23, and  
f the Western Pacific Order in  
cil, 1877, that the answer to the  
Member's question should be in  
affirmative, and that such a case  
d be triable by a Judicial Com-  
oner, with assessors.

#### IE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF CYPRUS.

2. PICTON (on behalf of Mr.  
UND ROBERTSON, Dundee): I beg  
k the Under Secretary of State for

the Colonies whether Captain Young's  
candidature for the Larnaca and Fama-  
gusta division in the recent elections  
for the Legislative Council of Cyprus  
had the sanction of the Colonial Office;  
whether he is aware that the decision  
in the trial of the election petition, by  
which the Native (Greek) candidates  
have been unseated, has caused grave  
dissatisfaction in Cyprus; and whether  
the Colonial Office will cause inquiry  
to be made into the action of Captain  
Young, Commissioner of Famagusta, in  
reference to this election, and into the  
allegations of undue influence on the  
part of the Government officials under  
him?

BARON H. DE WORMS: Captain  
Young's candidature was not known to  
and had not the sanction of the Colonial  
Office, such sanction not being techni-  
cally necessary, but the High Commis-  
sioner for Cyprus has been instructed  
to inform the public officers that they  
should not in future offer themselves  
for election unless expressly authorised.  
No official information has reached the  
Secretary of State with regard to the  
popular feeling respecting the decision  
in the election case, or as to any allega-  
tions of undue influence on the part of  
the Government officials, and he there-  
fore sees no reason to inquire into the  
latter allegation.

#### POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN SCOTLAND.

MR. ESSLEMONT (on behalf of Dr.  
CAMERON, Glasgow, College): I beg to  
ask the Postmaster General whether,  
when the South of Mull route between  
Oban and Bunessan is reopened this  
year, he will consider the feasibility of  
landing the mail bags for the Fuinafort  
district on the Ross of Mull side of the  
Sound of Iona, and so avoiding the de-  
lay in the service of the district which  
occurred under the arrangement of last  
year?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The  
matter will receive careful consideration.  
It is believed, however, that in certain  
winds and heavy seas it is dangerous  
to land and embark mails on the Ross  
of Mull side of the Island of Iona.

**WHITEHAVEN SANITARY DISTRICT.**

SIR JAMES BAIN (Whitehaven): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, with reference to the fact that the County Council of Cumberland made an order extending the limits of the Urban Sanitary District of Whitehaven, on which the Local Government Board afterwards held a local inquiry by their Inspector, Mr. Arnold Taylor, whether the Local Government Board refused to confirm the County Council's order on the Inspector's Report; and, if not, then upon what grounds; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of Mr. Arnold Taylor?

MR. RITCHIE: It became the duty of the Local Government Board to direct an inquiry in the case referred to, in consequence of an appeal by county electors against the order of the County Council extending the Whitehaven Urban District by including within its limits an area comprising more than 2,600 acres. The inquiry was a very exhaustive one, extending over seven days, and the evidence of a large number of witnesses was taken. The proposals were very strongly opposed by both owners and ratepayers in the areas proposed to be added, and with the exception of one gentleman, who is the Chairman of the Whitehaven Urban Authority, not one witness who was an owner or ratepayer in the outside area was called in support of the scheme. After full consideration of all the facts, the Local Government Board came to the conclusion that the evidence of those who were in favour of the extension of the district failed to show that there was any sufficient reason for the wide scheme of extension proposed, and that they had therefore no alternative but to disallow the order. The Reports which are made by the Inspectors of the Board on the inquiries held by them are very numerous, and I should not feel justified in consenting to the Report in this case being laid on the Table, and thus making a very inconvenient precedent.

**THE GREENWICH HOSPITAL.**

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord

of the Admiralty if he will state how much money has been expended during the last ten years on the maintenance and repairs of the buildings of Greenwich Hospital, now occupied by the Admiralty; the amount paid for rates and taxes, or contribution in lieu thereof; and how much of this would, in the case of an ordinary tenancy, have fallen upon the landlord, and how much upon the tenant?

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The amount expended during the last ten years on the maintenance and repairs of Greenwich Hospital, now occupied by the Admiralty, has been £31,770, and in new works, additions, and alterations, £8,660. The whole of this expenditure would in the case of an ordinary tenancy have fallen upon the landlord. The amount paid as contribution in lieu of rates during the same period for the college and schools combined has been £26,385, of which the proportion for the college only is approximately estimated at £21,000. The whole of this expenditure in an ordinary tenancy would have fallen upon the tenant. On the other hand, the rent paid by the Admiralty for the use of the college buildings has been £100 per annum.

**POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN CORK.**

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, having regard to the promise of the late Postmaster General, a daily post and evening collection will be given to the people of Rathcoole and Kilcorrey, County Cork?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSON: In July last the late Postmaster General promised, in reply to a question by the hon. Member for North Cork, that this subject should be carefully considered. On the 15th August the hon. Member was informed that the existing Postal Service between Banteer and Kilcorrey was already being conducted at a cost in excess of the revenue; and expressing regret that no further outlay could be incurred for improving the post. It is not likely that the circumstances have changed in any material degree since that time.

## INLAND REVENUE OFFICERS.

**MR. COBB:** I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that his refusal to see any of the supervisors, officers, or assistants of the Inland Revenue, with regard to the grievances alleged in their petition to the Treasury, has caused considerable dissatisfaction among them, in view of the fact that, when the Customs outdoor officers alleged that there were grievances in their branch of the Service which they requested might be remedied, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Financial Secretary to the Treasury held an inquiry and issued a Treasury Minute dealing with their complaints, which in March last was ordered to be printed, and was shortly afterwards published; whether any reason exists for treating the grievances alleged by the officials connected with the Excise in a different way from those alleged by the officials of the Customs; and whether he will re-consider his recent decision as to granting a short interview to one representative of the supervisors, officers, and assistants upon some of the points named in their petition, without undertaking so complete an inquiry as took place in the case of the officials of the Customs; or whether, as an alternative, he will direct any other kind of inquiry to be held?

**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER** (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The case of the Customs' Service, to which the hon. Member refers, was entirely different from that of the officers on whose behalf he now appeals to me. As a result of a discussion of the Customs' Service in this House, on a Motion for a Select Committee to inquire into grievances which were alleged to exist, but had not been investigated, I undertook, in substitution for this proposed Committee, to hold a formal inquiry myself into the conditions of the whole Customs Outdoor Service, of a nature similar to the inquiry which would be undertaken by a Select Committee. The conclusions at which we arrived were, as the hon. Member states, embodied in a Treasury Minute, and certain changes in the conditions of the Customs' Service were made in consequence. In

the recent case certain grievances were brought first before the Board of Inland Revenue, and through them to the Treasury, last year. They had very full and careful previous consideration from myself and my Colleagues, and I was able to meet the requests of the officers to some extent, and a very considerable sum was added to the aggregate of salaries, and some changes were made in other respects. At the same time, there were certain other points on which we were unable to meet the requests of the officers, and the petition which is now before me mainly consists of a request for re-consideration of those points. I am fully acquainted with the details of the case of the officers, and I entirely reject the suggestion of the hon. Member, that it is impossible for me to arrive at a just conclusion upon the alleged grievances without a personal interview with the officers concerned. If such interviews became customary in all cases in which grievances are alleged in any branch of the Civil Service, the time of Ministers would be entirely occupied in this manner, and the interest of Public Business would suffer. I can assure the hon. Member that, though I cannot grant such interviews, I take a deep interest in endeavouring as far as I can to master all those Civil Service questions, and that I fear the task of meeting all the wishes of Civil servants is absolutely hopeless.

**MR. COBB:** May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether I correctly gather from his answer that he will consent to the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the subject?

**MR. GOSCHEN:** No; because the grievances have been already inquired into; and if this House were to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the matter it would amount to a Vote of Want of Confidence in the result of the inquiry which has already taken place.

## COLLECTION OF AGRICULTURAL RETURNS.

**MR. J. O'KELLY** (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Excise officers have been either reduced or dismissed in connection with the collection of the

Agricultural Returns; and if he is aware that much dissatisfaction exists in the Service in reference to the work?

MR. GOSCHEN: Only two officers have been reduced, and four dismissed, in connection with the collection of Agricultural Statistics during the last ten years. I am not aware that there is serious dissatisfaction in the Service in reference to this work.

#### THE BAILIFF OF JERSEY AND THE DANIEL CASE.

MR. COBB: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between the Home Office and the Bailiff of the Island of Jersey with respect to the Daniel case?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): There has been no official correspondence between the Home Office and the Bailiff of Jersey. I have written private letters to the Bailiff; but I see no reason for laying them on the Table of the House. Full publicity has been given to the proceedings in the Daniel case.

#### NAVAL PENSIONERS.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many Naval pensioners of the age of 55 and upwards, who entered the Service prior to the issue of the Order in Council of the 29th June, 1878, have not yet received the full Greenwich age pension?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The number of pensioners over 55 years of age claiming pensions is estimated to be about 2,800. All such claimants entered the Service prior to 1865, up to which time no age pensions existed. The Order in Council of 1878 therefore did not, as the question suggests, break any condition of the engagement of these men, but only affected the granting of a boon to which, previously to 1865, they were not entitled.

*Mr. J. O'Kelly*

#### ARMAGH PRISON.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with regard to the fact that in 1889 the General Prisons Board directed certain Minutes to be communicated to an officer of Armagh Prison, upon whom a Report was made, whether the directions of the General Prisons Board were complied with; and, if not, what steps were taken to ascertain by whose default the omission was made; and what steps the General Prisons Board purpose taking with reference to further Reports from Armagh Prison?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The General Prisons Board report that it is the case that the officer in charge of the prison failed to communicate the Minute referred to. He was cautioned by the Board to be more careful in future.

MR. BLANE: I want to know what steps will the General Prisons Board take with reference to the Governor of Armagh Prison, after they have found that he had not communicated to the officer of the prison?

MR. JACKSON: I believe the General Prisons Board are quite able to look after their own Department; and if they think it necessary in this case I am quite sure they will take action.

MR. BLANE: I beg to give notice that on the Estimates I shall call attention to this particular case, and move a Resolution.

#### NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland have the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland had recent instances of the hardship resulting from the high average of 70, to maintain the services of an assistant teacher, on account of the decrease in population, prevalence of epidemics, the severe weather, &c.; and will anything be done to reduce the average or mitigate the rule?

MR. JACKSON: The Commissioners of National Education are not aware of any special cases of hardship arising from the rule mentioned in the ques-

ion. The Commissioners add that in all cases in which the school attendance is reduced owing to severe weather, prevalence of epidemic disease, or other exceptional cause, they invariably allow a reasonable time for the re-establishment of the normal average before proceeding to cancel the grant for an assistant.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman state whether it is a fact that in consequence of the influenza and the severity of the season this normal average has fallen in a great number of cases during the past year?

MR. JACKSON: No; as a matter of fact, during the past year—that is, the year ending on the 31st December last—I think the attendance has increased on the preceding year. There was, of course, a considerable falling off since, in consequence of the influenza.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Commissioners of National Education issue at intervals private instructions to their Inspectors on matters such as the interpretation of the programmes, the mode of conducting examinations, &c., which are never made known to the teachers, and why do the Commissioners not follow the practice of the Education Departments of England and Scotland, which allow their Inspectors to consult with the teachers?

MR. JACKSON: The Commissioners of National Education report that they issue from time to time, according to the requirements of the service, special instructions to their Inspectors regarding the details of their duties, and that such portions as it is deemed essential that the teachers should be made acquainted with are communicated through the managers. The Commissioners encourage their Inspectors to confer with the teachers and managers, and to assist in a matter bearing on the interests of the schools and the efficiency of the teachers; and they are aware that such consultation is of frequent occurrence, and is attended with satisfactory results.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware whether a different practice prevails in England, and will he undertake to have the

practice of the Irish and the English Education Offices brought into harmony in this matter?

MR. JACKSON: I am not aware, and I can do no more than bring the matter before the notice of the National Board.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I will call attention to this matter again.

#### ENFIELD SMALL ARMS FACTORY.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) (on behalf of Mr. James Rowlands): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the case that notices have been given dismissing men at the Small Arms Factory at Enfield since Monday last; whether 75 men are now under notice to leave; whether 27 notices were served on Wednesday on the stock-filers, and whether there are only about 60 stock-filers in all at Enfield; and whether he will undertake that no more notices shall be served until further inquiry has been made?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (MR. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): It is reported to me that the numbers in the question are substantially correct. I have already stated that any necessary reduction shall be made with as little hardship as possible, but the diminution in our orders absolutely necessitates some reduction.

#### THE LATE CONVICT P. W. NALLY.

MR. J. C. FLYNN (on behalf of Mr. McCARTAN, Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland with reference to the evidence given at the inquest on the remains of P. W. Nally, who died in Mountjoy Gaol on 9th November last, whether he is aware that Dr. O'Keefe, the prison doctor, deposed at the inquest that Nally required outdoor work to keep up his health; that he was punished and lost marks on the charge of having shouted "God save Ireland" at Downpatrick Railway Station; and that he was forcibly removed from Downpatrick to Mountjoy Prison where he was reported "sick" on the 8th October, and on the 19th October the disease was declared to be typhoid fever; whether any word was sent to Nally's friends before the first week in



November; and if he will explain why his brother Dr. Nally was refused permission to remain with him on the night he was dying; and why, when the term of his imprisonment had almost expired, he was not allowed to go into the Mater Miserecordian Hospital; and whether he will grant a sworn inquiry into his prison treatment up to the time of his death?

MR. JACKSON: The General Prisons Board report that the medical officer states that he did not depose, as alleged in the question, that Nally required outdoor exercise. Nally was punished for misconduct, which consisted of shouting in a loud and disorderly manner, calculated to create a disturbance at Downpatrick Railway Station on 19th November, 1888, and likewise lost marks. There was no force used in his transfer from Downpatrick to Mountjoy Prison, to which he was removed in company with other prisoners on 1st April, 1891, from which date Downpatrick was closed as a convict prison. Nally's friends were not informed of his illness before the first week in November. He himself had specially desired that his friends should not be informed, and up to that time his case was progressing favourably. It is not the case that his brother was refused permission to remain. On the contrary, his brother was present at his death, as were also his sister and three other relatives. Under the rules prisoners are not discharged on the ground of health except on a certificate from the medical officer that further confinement is likely to endanger life. In the present case there was not only no such certificate, but the medical officer reports that the prisoner told his brother that he was well treated. He did not express any desire to be released from custody, and in the opinion of the medical officer his removal to another hospital would have in no way benefited him. I would add that an outside eminent medical doctor was called in for consultation, and he fully agreed in the way in which the case was being treated, and expressed his belief that nothing was being left undone to promote the recovery of the patient.

*Mr. J. C. Flynn*

The Government do not see anything in the circumstances of the case calling for the course suggested in the last paragraph.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): As the death of this prisoner was accelerated by his treatment, and as the whole case will be the subject of debate in this House, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will afford us the necessary information by laying a copy of the coroner's inquisition on the Table?

MR. FLYNN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman at the same time is he not aware or can he give us any information as to whether it is not the usual practice to discharge prisoners in case of serious ill-health?

MR. JACKSON: I am not aware of any other practice than that prisoners are discharged only on a certificate from the medical officer that further confinement is likely to endanger life. With respect to the question of the hon. Member for West Belfast, I will inquire whether it is possible to lay a copy of the coroner's inquisition upon the Table.

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he would not reconsider the question whether the medical officer failed to give a certificate of serious ill-health when he discovered that the prisoner was suffering from typhoid fever?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I should also like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it was not stated at the inquest that Nally had been engaged in cleaning out the piggeries when he contracted the fatal disease, and that some of the pigs had died in consequence of the unsanitary condition of the place?

MR. JACKSON: If the hon. Gentleman will put down the question I will endeavour to answer it. As to the question of the hon. Member for Mayo, I do not know that there was the slightest neglect on the part of the medical officer of the prison, and if my recollection serves me, the evidence given at the inquest went to exonerate the doctor from any neglect. I believe there was a complaint that the typhoid character of the disease was not discovered at an earlier stage; but I

believe that that is not unusual, and that there is not the smallest ground for any allegation of neglect on the part of the medical officer.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the prison doctor reported to the General Prisons Board that this prisoner was in danger of death?

MR. JACKSON: If the hon. Gentleman puts down the question perhaps I shall be able to get the information.

MR. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.) was understood to inquire if the right hon. Gentleman was aware whether the treatment Nally received was not owing to his refusal to give evidence at the Arncliffe Commission?

MR. JACKSON: No, Sir. That is a question which it is impossible for me to answer.

#### THE BALACLAVA SIX HUNDRED.

MR. FLYNN (on behalf of Mr. 'CARTAN): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a statement made in the *Sunday Chronicle*, of the 14th inst., to the effect that, for some time past, the 30 impoverished survivors of the Balacava Six Hundred have been receiving, out of a fund voluntarily subscribed through that paper, 15s. a week, or such addition to their pensions as made the whole amount to 15s. per week; whether he is aware that this fund is now exhausted, and that 18 of these veteran soldiers are now pensionless, while one receives 3s. 6d. per day, four a pension of 1s. 1d. per day, and the other seven payments varying from 1s. to 4d. per day; and whether, considering the services of these men, and the danger to which they exposed themselves in the public service, he will take steps to have them supplied with a competency for their old days?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to refer him to the answer I gave on a former occasion on this subject.

DR. TANNER: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform us whether it is not a fact that a number of these unfortunate men have been driven into the workhouse for want of attention from the Department?

The question was not answered.

#### SCOTCH TRAWLING.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate in how many, and in what, bays in Scotland is trawling forbidden, also in what bays is steam trawling forbidden; if, when a large majority of the fishermen residing near any Scotch bay desire that trawling should be prohibited, do the Scotch Authorities consider and give effect to this desire; and has he any evidence to show whether the fishermen near any bay consider that the prohibition of trawling in certain bays has improved the supply of fish?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): In reply to the first and second paragraphs of the question, I would refer the hon. Member to the Herring Fishery (Scotland) Act, 1889, by which trawling is forbidden within three miles of low water mark. It is also forbidden at a number of places mentioned in the Schedule to the Act. The Fishery Board may, by bye-law, exempt portions of the coast from the operation of the Act; but I understand that this power has been sparingly used. The Act makes no distinction between steam trawlers and other trawlers. With regard to the last paragraph of the question, I am not aware of any evidence of the nature referred to; but I shall inquire if it exists, and communicate with the hon. Member.

COLONEL NOLAN: I should like the Lord Advocate to give us the gist of the Act of 1889, for I confess I am not up in Scotch law.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

#### IRISH TRAWLING.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in how many, and in what, bays in Ireland is trawling forbidden, also in what bays is steam trawling forbidden; if, when a large majority of the fishermen residing near any bay desire that trawling should be prohibited, do the Irish Authorities consider and give effect to this desire; and has he any evidence to show whether the fishermen near any bay consider that the non-prohibition of trawling has injured the take of fish?

Mr. JACKSON : I am sorry I have not had sufficient time to get an answer to the question of the hon. Member.

COLONEL NOLAN : It is very unusual for one Minister to answer and another not to do so. I wanted to see from the answers of both Ministers whether—

Mr. SPEAKER : Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman put his question ?

COLONEL NOLAN : I am sorry to say I have not got an answer to my question. I will put down another to the Lord Advocate.

#### THE CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR COMMISSION.

Mr. LANE (Cork Co., E.) : I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there is any representative of Ireland on the Royal Commission appointed to organise the British Section at the Chicago World's Fair ; how many Irish representatives are on the eleven committees (consisting of 387 members) appointed by the Royal Commission for the various sections ; is he aware that the Royal Commissioners have given no information by advertisement or circulars to manufacturers or other intending exhibitors in Ireland, though the time for applying for space expires on the 29th instant ; that they are charging exhibitors at the rate of £25 per 100 square feet for space given free by the World's Fair to all exhibitors ; and that their minimum charge for the smallest exhibit is £5, though exhibitors must pay all cost of transportation, erection, maintenance, and insurance ; and have the Royal Commissioners any accredited agent or offices in Ireland where intending exhibitors can apply for information or space ?

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir J. GORST, Chatham) : The answer to the first question is, I am informed, in the affirmative. Ten gentlemen, specially appointed as representing Irish industries and education, besides several other Irishmen not so specially appointed, are serving on the various committees. Seven others were invited to do so, but did not accept the invitation. Circulars have been sent to all Irish exhibitors at previous International Exhibitions and to many other manufacturers, and ad-

vertisements have been inserted in Irish papers. The charge to exhibition is £23 10s. per 100 square feet, and the minimum is £5. There is at Dublin a joint committee, formed by the Corporation, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Royal Dublin Society, who hold all information at the disposal of Irish exhibitors.

#### POSTAGE OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES CIRCULARS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) : I beg to ask the Postmaster General when the reduction of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the postal rate of the circulars of Friendly Societies will come into force ?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON : In November last an alteration was made in the Book Post regulations, so as to allow a circular (which fulfils the conditions of being wholly or in great part printed, and of being in identical terms to several persons) to be attached to any other document admissible by book post. The circular notices of meetings sent out by Friendly Societies, therefore, may now have a statement of account appended on the same sheet without losing the privilege of passing at the book rate of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per 2 oz. ; but the statement must be kept apart, and not embodied in the circular.

#### THE MCKINLEY TARIFF AND RECIPROCITY.

COLONEL HOWARD VINCENT : I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs with what nations have the United States concluded arrangements for the free or more favoured admission of American natural and manufactured productions under the Reciprocity Section of the McKinley Tariff Act ; if in those markets the exports of the United Kingdom and British Colonies will be at a disadvantage compared to American exports ; and whether the Washington Government have issued notices to various other States that if before 15th March they do not decide to give an advantage to American goods the President will, by decree already authorised by Congress, impose prohibitory duties on their consignments to the markets of the United States ?

**MR. J. W. LOWTHER:** Arrangements of the nature referred to have been concluded between the Government of the United States and the Governments of Brazil, Santo Domingo, Guatemala, and Spain for Cuba and Porto Rico. In Brazil and Santo Domingo British goods will consequently be at some disadvantage as compared with imports from the United States. An announcement of a character referred to in the third paragraph of the hon. Member's question has already been made by the Government of the United States.

**POST OFFICE AT VENTRY AND FENIT.**

**SIR THOMAS ESMONDE** (Dublin, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the Post Office has opened a telegraph station at Ventry, County Kerry, without any guarantee being given; and, if so, whether the Post Office will be the same at Fenit, and without further delay, to help the fishing on that portion of the coast, which opens 15th March?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** A telegraph office was opened at Ventry without any guarantee, because it was estimated that the revenue would cover the expenses; but one could not be established at Fenit without guarantee, seeing that the revenue would not cover the expenses. Some of those who are interested in the locality have undertaken to give the guarantee, and when the necessary agreement has been executed instructions will be given for a telegraph office to be established as soon as possible.

**THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACT—  
EVICTED TENANTS.**

**MR. T. W. RUSSELL** (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any evicted tenants have taken advantage of Section 13 of the Land Purchase Act of last Session; and if any such tenants have done so, how many, and to what estates do the applications refer?

**MR. JACKSON:** The Land Commissioners report that, under the 14th of their general rules of the

15th August, a period of two months is allowed, during which the agreements executed before the 5th February under the 13th section of the Act referred to may be lodged with the Commission. Up to the present eleven such applications have been lodged relating to nine estates. These are the cases of which the Commissioners have official knowledge; but they point out that it is a matter of general notoriety that a number of such agreements were entered into, though they have not come officially before them.

**MR. DILLON:** May I ask if any landlords in Ireland gave their tenants opportunity to avail themselves of this section on reasonable terms?

**MR. T. C. HARRINGTON** (Dublin, Harbour): May I ask if any landlords in the County Court refused the request of the tenants that they should be allowed to purchase?

**MR. JACKSON:** I must have notice of these questions.

**MR. SEXTON** (Belfast, W.): Did the eleven applications of the right hon. Gentleman referred to represent eleven tenants?

**MR. JACKSON:** I believe that is so.

**OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE RIVER BANN.**

**MR. M'CARTAN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution, unanimously adopted by the Ballymoney Board of Guardians on the 15th instant, to the effect that the obstructions for navigation and drainage purposes placed in the River Bann, after an experience of 40 years, have proved to be useless, and requesting the Government to remove the obstacles; and whether he will consider the desirability of having them removed with as little delay as possible?

**MR. JACKSON:** Assuming that the "obstructions" referred to are the weirs and navigation locks, the Government have no power to remove them; they formed part of a scheme carried out under the authority of Parliament, and can only be removed by the same authority.

## INSPECTION OF KITCHEN BOILERS.

MR. CRAIG (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the explosion of a kitchen boiler at Newcastle, attended with loss of life, and to the evidence at the inquest, as well as the Coroner's remarks as to the necessity of such boilers being inspected; and whether he will consider the desirability of passing an Act to deal with the matter?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, Sir; I have received a Report from the Coroner and the depositions taken at the inquest. The accident appears to have been due to the freezing of the taps—of which the occupier of the house was made aware—and to the defective construction of the boiler. I do not think that official inspection of kitchen boilers in private houses is a matter on which legislation is desirable.

MR. CRAIG: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman to inquire whether in the United States there are not Inspectors whose duty it is to inspect boilers in private houses?

## THE RATING OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can inform the House when the Bill relating to the Exemption of Elementary Schools from Rating, mentioned in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, will be introduced?

MR. RITCHIE: We must make further progress with the Bills now before the House before I can say anything respecting the Bill referred to.

## CABLE COMPANIES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether any and what charges are levied from the Cable Companies respectively in respect of telegrams sent through their lines to and from this country; and whether he has ascertained the total number of words received by cable in this country from and despatched to Africa, the West Indies, North and South America, India and the East, and Australasia respectively, in each year?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Cable Companies pay £5 a year for the telegraph wires which they transmit their messages this country. For messages handed at Postal Telegraph Offices to be forwarded by cable, or for messages arriving by cable and transmitted over wires, the Department charge the ordinary inland rate of ½d. a word. I have not ascertained the total number of words received by cable in this country from, and despatched to, the countries named, and I have no means of doing so.

## SOUTH WALES COLLIERY STATISTICS.

MR. DAVID THOMAS (M. Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department can give the production of coal, the number of persons employed (distinguishing between surface and underground), and the number of lives lost through accident at collieries in the South Wales district during 1895; the number of fatal accidents and deaths resulting therefrom in each year of underground employment; and, being that much of the interest and of the Mines Inspectors' Reports, the summaries of the statistical year of them is lost by the delay in publication, whether he will take steps to expedite their presentation to Parliament?

MR. MATTHEWS: There has been no delay in the publication of the statistics. The summaries for the districts are now in the printer's hands and will be laid before Parliament in a few days' time, when the hon. Member will obtain all the information he desires. I may remind the hon. Member that the mine owners are not required by the Statute to send the Return to the Inspectors before 21st January; therefore the tabulation of figures for 3,400 collieries, as well as from the numerous mines, has this year been prepared by the Inspectors with commendable despatch.

## ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY PENSIONS.

MR. HARRISON (Tipperary): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the

quer whether he is aware that, under the 10 and 11 Vic. c. 100, s. 3, any member of the Royal Irish Constabulary who retired from that force between 1866 and 1st August, 1874 might do so on full pay; that those who joined the force before 1847 might be on full pay after 20 years' service; and that those who joined it after that time might retire on full pay after 30 years' service; whether he is aware that the late Sir Stafford Northcote, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in January, 1877, stated that it was the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown that this was the correct interpretation of the Statute; and whether, nevertheless, £5 a head per annum was deducted from the pensions granted to all those men; and, if so, whether the Government will now take into consideration the propriety of revising the pensions in such cases, and giving the men the full pay claimed by them?

MR. GOSCHEN: The section quoted by the hon. Member permits the award of pensions not exceeding, as a maximum, the rates mentioned in the Statute. The statement of Sir Stafford Northcote in the Debate of 1877 as to the opinion given by the Law Officers is as follows:—

"Although the Government might pay the higher rate, the men were not legally entitled to a higher rate of pension than had been awarded, and there was no legal reason for giving them more now."

I am assured that the pensions actually awarded to the constables in question are not £15 a year below the maximum allowed by the Statute. The Government in 1877, after a very full inquiry, are satisfied that the equity of the men's case was fully met by the decision then arrived at.

#### TRADE SOCIETIES AND THE COST OF CERTIFICATES.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Haslebeck): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that members of registered trade societies are charged 6d. for every certificate, and an additional 1s. for "searching the register for the same for one year's record; whether he is aware also that Section 2, Sub-section 2, of "The Friendly Societies Act, 1875," enacts that no

registered society shall pay money on the decease of a member without a registrar's certificate of death, which must be supplied at a maximum cost of 1s.; and whether he will take steps to amend the law relating to registered trade societies in accordance with the Friendly Societies Act?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am desired by my right hon. Friend to answer this question. It is correct that by Section 14 (2) of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875, a registered friendly society is prohibited from paying money on the death of a member or other person without a registrar's certificate of death; and it is provided that such certificate may be obtained for 1s. Neither of these provisions exists in the Act relating to trade unions. They are not compelled to get certificates of death; but, if they do get them, they must pay the registrar of deaths his usual charge. I will take into consideration the suggestion to amend the law relating to registered trade societies in accordance with the Friendly Societies Act.

#### OVERCROWDING ON RAILWAYS.

MR. J. WILSON (Lanark, Govan): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the officials of a railway company who fail to supply sufficient third class accommodation are at liberty to fill the first and second class compartments with third class passengers; and, if not, whether the Board of Trade are prepared to take measures to deal with what on certain lines is a crying evil?

\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH: I think that what the hon. Member complains of is not that passengers holding third class tickets are allowed to travel in carriages of a higher class, but that passengers are inconvenienced by the railway officials allowing their carriages to be overcrowded. Such passengers may have a remedy by civil action, but on that I cannot give an opinion. I quite admit the evil of overcrowding, but it is an evil very difficult to prevent. An official may stop people from getting into a tramcar or omnibus—it is quite another thing to keep a crowd out of a train, and though I should readily consider

any suggestions on the subject, I am not at present prepared to propose legislation on it.

#### THE FORESTRY COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

MR. HARRISON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the late First Lord of the Treasury, in answer to a question on the 26th March, 1888, stated that, though the Government had come to no decision as to the Report of the Select Committee on Forestry made in the previous year, yet the question would have to be dealt with by the Agricultural Department; and whether any steps have been, are being, or will be, taken to carry out the very strong recommendations embodied in that Report in favour of the appointment of a Forestry Board, the establishment of schools of forestry, and the planting of trees over large areas of the United Kingdom, and especially in the West of Ireland?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (MR. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): The powers of the Board of Agriculture in regard to forestry do not extend to Ireland, but I am informed that the question of forestry in that country is being dealt with by the Congested Districts Board, who are making an experiment on a considerable scale in Connemara. I am aware of the statement that was made by the First Lord of the Treasury in March, 1888; and when the Board of Agriculture was constituted, the recommendation of the Select Committee in favour of the appointment of a Board of Forestry was carried out to this extent, that certain powers with regard to forestry were conferred upon the Board. Within those powers, we have done, I think, everything that we can. We have no power to establish schools; we can only aid existing institutions; and on two different occasions we have made grants towards the cost of lectures in the University of Edinburgh under the auspices of the Royal Scottish Arboricultural Society, and there is now before me a scheme for the delivery of lectures to a class of practical foresters in the Royal Botanical Gardens in that city. The Board

have also made a grant in aid of a new chair in the Durham College of Science, which is to include the teaching of forestry, and I hope to give favourable consideration to some other proposals which have been made to me for providing increased facilities for such teaching elsewhere. I am in entire sympathy with the desire to promote a sounder knowledge of forestry, and I shall be glad to take every available opportunity of effecting this purpose.

#### THE LATE SENATOR JAMES G. ROSS.

MR. HOZIER (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give any information with regard to the administration of the estate of the late Senator James G. Ross, who died at Quebec in October, 1888, leaving property valued at some seven or eight million dollars, and bequeathing by his will half of that property to his brother, Mr. Frank Ross, and the other half to Protestant charities at Quebec and to Protestant charities and relations at Carlisle, Lanarkshire, where he was born?

MR. CURZON (for Baron H de Worms): The subject does not come under the cognizance of the Colonial Office, so that I am unable to afford my hon. Friend the information he desires. I would suggest that he should put himself in communication with the authorities of the Province of Quebec.

#### POSTAGE OF POLLING CARDS.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, for the purposes of Parliamentary and municipal elections, polling cards bearing the registered numbers either in writing or in print may be allowed to pass through the post as an ordinary post-card?

\*THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (SIR JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): Under a new definition of circular about to be adopted, polling cards will be allowed to pass at the book rate, provided the contents are wholly printed; and a deputation of agents which called upon me recently stated there would be no

*Sir Michael Hicks Beach*

difficulty in printing the voter's number on the register with the rest of the card. It is undesirable to permit varying particulars in writing in a particular.

**MR. CREMER:** It is impossible for me, Sir, to catch the nature of the right hon. Gentleman's reply. I would like a direct answer to the question as to whether polling cards will be allowed to pass through the net if the numbers are written instead of being printed?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** No, Sir; it is not thought fit to make separate rules for polling cards, but I am informed by a number of agents that they can quite conveniently manage to have these varying numbers printed. In that case, they would be allowed to pass at the ordinary rate.

**MR. CREMER:** Will clerks undertake to fill in the numbers in place of the written ones, which candidates or their agents are prepared to supply?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** I cannot answer for the clerks; but I am informed there is no practical difficulty in having the numbers printed.

**MR. CREMER:** I am sorry to interfere again, but this is a very important question, especially at this particular juncture. Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the clerks at the Post Office were prepared to insert printed numbers in lieu of the written ones—(cries of "No, no!")—and will he say whether polling cards must have the numbers printed?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** I have been told by the agents that there would be no difficulty in having the numbers printed. I have altered the existing rules in order to remove the difficulties that exist in the way of sending out these cards for one half-penny.

**MR. MORTON (Peterborough):** May the number be printed on either side of the card?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSON:** Yes.

#### THE GOVERNOR OF NEW ZEALAND.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury):** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies a question of which I have given him private notice, reference to a telegram published in

the *Times*, whether any communication has been received by Her Majesty's Government from the Government of New Zealand, relative to the appointment of a successor to Lord Onslow; and if so, what reply has been given?

**\*BARON H. DE WORMS:** I have not received from the hon. Member any private notice, and I would suggest that in future any such notice should be sent direct to me as representing the Colonial Department in this House. In answer to this question, I have to say that no cable message has been received by the Secretary of State from New Zealand, and it follows that no reply has been sent. In the telegram which appeared in this morning's papers the Secretary of State has seen, with some surprise, that he has been charged with a breach of faith in not having submitted the name of Lord Onslow's successor before a final appointment was made. There is not the slightest ground for such a charge of breach of faith, if it has been really made, as the Secretary of State has invariably acted upon the decision of Her Majesty's Government conveyed in the Circular Despatch of 8th July, 1889, published in (C 5,828). A telegram was sent to the Governor of New Zealand directly the Secretary of State received Her Majesty's approval of the appointment of the Earl of Glasgow, and any prior report which appeared in the papers was made without authority.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON:** As a matter of personal explanation I beg to say that I had a personal interview with the Secretary of State for the Colonies before 3 o'clock, and he undertook to see the Under Secretary.

#### PROCEEDINGS AT BANTRY QUARTER SESSIONS.

**MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.):** I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been called to the proceedings at Bantry Quarter Sessions early in February, at which a tenant named John Keohane brought an action against Edward Godfrey, P.L.G., estate bailiff to Lord Kenmare, for illegal seizures and distraint of cattle; is he aware that it was proved at these proceedings that Lord Kenmare used to charge 12s. for every distress warrant



against his tenants whether executed or not, and appropriated these illegal charges to his own use; and in view of the fact that Lord Kenmare is a Justice of the Peace, as well as his agent Mr. Maurice Leonard, will the Lord Chancellor take notice of these proceedings?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): I am informed that in the case referred to, the question of the illegality of the charges in respect of the distress warrants was not decided or gone into by the Judge who tried the case. The question, therefore, contained in the third paragraph does not arise.

#### CONSTABLE COURTNEY.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received from the Cork County Grand Jury a Resolution asking of the Government, in the case of the £1,000 compensation granted to Constable Courtney (owing to injuries received at the hands of men of the Limerick Militia), "as a matter of justice to the ratepayers of the county to defray half the sum out of the Imperial funds"; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I did receive, through the Irish Government, the resolution of the Cork County Grand Jury. It appears that the compensation to the injured constable, so far as it is payable by the public, is fixed by Statute, and I am in communication with the Treasury on the subject. I do not think that the proposal of the Cork Grand Jury is unreasonable.

#### CIVIL SERVANTS' RETIREMENT.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he will give the promised Return of the Civil servants exempted from the retirement at 65 rule, and what causes the delay in giving the information?

MR. GOSCHEN: In the application of a General Order to so large a body of men as the Civil Service, some cases must arise which require consideration and discussion, but I hope to be in a position to present the Return in question before long.

*Mr. Flynn*

#### "POLITICAL" PRISONERS IN PORTLAND PRISON.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has seen in *The Irish Daily Independent*, of the 22nd instant, a report of a visit to Portland Prison, supplied by a correspondent who accompanied the hon. Member for Waterford City, who recently visited the Irish political prisoners therein confined; and whether he is aware that the prisoners (as described in this newspaper) were, during a severe snow-storm, harnessed to a wagon-load of stones on the roadside, and that the men had a regular harness attached to them; and, if so, whether he will discontinue the practice?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, Sir, I have seen this newspaper report. In several respects it is inaccurate. The storm which had prevailed on the previous day and in the morning of the day in question, had subsided, and the prisoners were employed in drawing materials from some quarter under repair in hand carts, eight or ten men to each cart. The equipment was the same as is used by sailors and soldiers when drawing field artillery. I see no reason why this kind of work should be discontinued.

#### DR. GALLAGHER.

MR. FLAVIN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Dr. Gallagher, who is undergoing a sentence of penal servitude for life in Chatham prison, has for more than a year been refused permission to write to his friends in America?

MR. MATTHEWS: This prisoner wrote to his friends in America in November last, but he has received no reply to this letter or to his previous communications.

#### ENNISKILLEN GAOL AND THE PRISONS' BOARD.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Prisons' Board claim the area in front of the gaol in Enniskillen, extending from the gaol wall to the channel adjoining the country road leading south to Castle-

moole; and, if so, is it the duty of the Board to keep it in proper repair and clean it: will they either do so or hand it over to the Local Authority, the Town Commissioners, to put it into and keep it in proper condition; and is this gaol now used as a prison, or is it intended that the Authorities will discontinue its use as such, and permit it to fall into further dilapidation; if not, will they instruct an engineer to inspect and report on the condition and appearance of the outside front wall, doors, &c., with a view to due repairs?

MR. JACKSON: I must ask the hon. Member to defer this question for a short time pending inquiries.

#### THE LAND COMMISSIONERS IN ENNISKILLEN AND INCREASE OF RENTS.

MR. JORDAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that rents in many cases and generally were increased by the Land Commissioners in Enniskillen, county Fermanagh, last week; and if he will state the number of cases in which rents were thus increased, and the number in which they were reduced, at those sittings; and the number of appeals by the landlord and tenant respectively, both in the cases of increased and reduced rents?

MR. JACKSON: I have telegraphed for the information, but it has not come to hand. I, therefore, must ask the hon. Member to give notice of the question.

#### LISTOWEL AND TARBERT LIGHT RAILWAY.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received any representations from Listowel and Tarbert about the proposed construction of a light railway between those towns in North Kerry, and whether he will inquire into the proposals with the object of recommending the Treasury to make an advance of money under the Light Railways Act towards the construction of this line of railway?

MR. JACKSON: I have not received any representations on the subject mentioned. As stated, however, in reply to a similar question put

by the hon. Member for North Kerry, on the 4th August last, some representations had been then received, but no definite scheme had been brought under the notice of the Government.

#### THE MARQUESS OF DONEGALL.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the salary which is paid to the Marquess of Donegall as Clerk of the Peace for the County of Antrim; whether he is aware that the Marquess of Donegall has not been in the County of Antrim for upwards of 20 years; and whether it is in accordance with practice to have as Clerk of the Peace of an Irish county a gentleman who never visits the county, and who cannot be seen by any person who has cause of complaint to make to him?

MR. JACKSON: The county-officer referred to was not appointed by nor is he under the control of the Government. I would, however, point out that, under the County Officers and Courts Act of 1877, all future appointments will be to the combined office of Clerk of the Crown and Peace, the duties of which must be discharged in person.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

##### EDUCATION AND LOCAL TAXATION RELIEF (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): I should like, Sir, to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say what course the Government are going to take with regard to the Equivalent Grant to Scotland Bill, which was under consideration last night, and if a decision has been come to upon the point of difficulty which led to the Debate being interrupted? Further, I should like to ask how the Government propose to deal with that question of the money which has accrued during the present year, because we were assured again and again last night by the Lord Advocate that that money was to be dealt with by the Bill, and yet there is in the Supplementary Estimates a Vote in respect to that money. It is obvious it cannot be dealt with in both ways, and I should like to know what course the Government mean to take.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The money will, of course, require to be voted, whether it is, or is not, in the Bill. I think, in view of the very wide divergence of opinion expressed by many Scotch Members on both sides last night with regard to that Bill, and the prospect of discussion then opened out, and the very limited time that remains before 31st March, it may possibly be advisable to deal with the £120,000 by estimate and not by Bill. With regard to the Bill itself, my right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate will to-day put down the proper notice for introducing the Bill in Committee of the Whole House. The subject has been considered by the authorities of the House, and they have come to the conclusion that that is the proper course to take. I ought to say that some misconception appears to have arisen, though not from anything that has dropped from me as to those responsible for the error in point of technical order. The authorities of the House are in no sense to blame in the matter, for the Bill was not submitted to them until a comparatively late hour last night. The House is, perhaps, aware that in cases where there is doubt as to whether a Bill should be introduced in Committee or the Whole House, or in a more ordinary way, it is usual to appeal to the Public Bill Office for a decision on the point. That, unfortunately, was not done in the present case, and it was in that way that the mistake arose. The House will see that the matter is not free from difficulty when I mention that, though the Scotch Bill deals with the equivalent grant for Scotland, and the Irish Bill with the equivalent grant for Ireland, it is necessary to introduce the Scotch Bill in Committee of the Whole House, but not necessary that the Irish Bill should be so introduced.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the promised Papers on Mombassa will be presented. I do not complain of their non-presentation, but I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman, under the circumstances, to postpone until Thursday the Vote for the preliminary survey

for the railway from the coast. I should also like to hear what the business on Monday will be.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, there is a certain inconvenience in not taking the Supplementary Estimates in the order in which they appear. I understand there are Votes in which the Irish Members take a deep interest, and I understand they would be glad to have them discussed at the earliest moment. If that is so, it might be to the general convenience of the House to take the discussion on the Irish Votes on Monday, reserving the discussion on West African affairs until Thursday.

MR. J. E. ELLIS: Will the Supplementary Estimates be the first Order of the Day?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the intention of the Government, and I understand it to be the desire of the House to take the Irish Votes first. In that case I will put them down first, and on Thursday we will begin where the Committee left off last night—with the Foreign Office Vote, Class IV.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the lamentable waste of time caused by the ignorance of Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, he will take steps in future to prevent such a waste of time, and will consult the authorities of the House before bringing in a Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I apprehend that what occurred last evening would be a warning, if warning were required, to the various Departments; and as to the suggestion of waste of time, I hope that will not be so, but that the discussion which occurred will be sufficient to satisfy the desires of hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I understand that no Supply will be taken to-night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly; I shall take no Supply until the opinion of the House has been taken on the Bill relating to education in Ireland.

MR. T. M. HEALY: If we once get into Supply we shall get away from that measure, because the National Education Bill stands as No. 3 on the Paper, while Supply is No. 1.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Supply is put down as the ordinary Order on a Friday evening, in reference to which hon.

members may have the right to move amendments, but there is no operative reply before the House, and the National Education Bill stands as the second Order of the Day.

**MR. BRYCE:** As I see the Vice President of the Council in his place, I would like to ask him when he expects the so-called Draft Charter of the Durham University to be presented and distributed?

**MR. W. HART DYKE:** I regret the delay which has occurred very much. I expected the charter would have been circulated before now, but I will make inquiry into the matter.

### MOTIONS.

**MR. DE COBAIN.**

**6.35.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR:** In order to move the Motion upon the Paper, I do not think it will be necessary, and I am certain it would not be agreeable to myself or the House, that I should dwell upon the Motion which stands in my name. The question is familiar to the House, having been before it during the present Session and part of last Session, and all I need say is that I endeavour to follow the precedent which Parliament has set on unhappy occasions of this kind, and to avoid the appearance of injustice to the gentleman referred to in the Resolution. By this Resolution the House is not, of course, constitute a Court of Law. We are not a tribunal to decide whether the charge against Mr.

Cobain is well or ill-founded, and we are ill-suited to undertake an investigation of that kind. The only ground on which we pass this Resolution is that we have been made aware that a warrant is out against Mr. De Cobain, and that, knowing that warrant was against him, he has remained in a foreign country, outside the jurisdiction of the law. He has been ordered to attend in his place in this House, and that Order has been served upon him, but he has refused to obey it. We commit ourselves to no proposition in any way prejudicing his case, but I think it will be felt by this House, as it has been felt by a previous House of Commons under similar painful circumstances, that we ought not

to allow one to remain among our number who, with such a charge hanging over him, refuses to submit himself to the tribunals of this country, to have his name cleared, if so be he is innocent.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain, a Member of this House, having been charged with having committed, and with having incited the commission of gross and criminal acts of indecency, and warrants issued for his apprehension, and the said Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain having failed to obey an Order of this House, that he should attend in his place upon Tuesday the 23rd day of this instant February, and having fled from justice, be expelled this House."—*(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)*

**(6.38.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.):** I only rise because I think the Resolution ought to be expressed in decent English, and that the several offences constituting the charge against Mr. De Cobain should not be presented in a topsy-turvy manner, but should be presented to the House in the order in which they occur. I would suggest that the Resolution should read thus:—

"That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain, a Member of this House, having been charged with having committed, and with having incited to the commission of gross and criminal acts of indecency, and warrants having been issued for his apprehension; and the said Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain having fled from justice, and failed to obey the Order of this House, that he should attend in his place upon Tuesday, the 23rd day of this instant February, he be expelled from this House."

The Motion as it stands on the Paper is neither chronological nor intelligible, and as I think it should be chronological, grammatical, and intelligible, I beg to move accordingly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** This is proposed in the nature of an Amendment, and possibly the House may accept the Motion in this amended form.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

### ORDER OF THE DAY.

#### SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## PUBLIC MEETINGS IN SCHOOLROOMS.

## RESOLUTION.

\*(6.40) MR. HERBERT GARDNER (Essex, Saffron Walden) : The proposition contained in the Resolution I have to move is not novel in this House, and therefore I shall not have to intrude upon the attention of the House at any great length. Since the Parliament of 1886 I have endeavoured to impress this question upon the attention of the House and of the country, and, with the exception of one instance, the Resolution has been opposed on every occasion by the Government and hon. Members opposite. The reasons in favour of this Motion are principally three : first, the scarcity in rural districts of places for holding public meetings, and consequently the necessity of using the schools for the purpose ; secondly, that the State has a right to claim the use of schoolrooms for public occasions ; and, thirdly, because the use of these rooms has often been granted or withheld upon inconvenient or unfair principles. If I can prove this, perhaps I shall have gone far to convince hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Resolution is as necessary as it is moderate. Before the Franchise Bill of 1885 the constituents of County Members were, generally speaking, well-to-do men, who could drive into the county town to hear the County Member ; but under the new electorate there is a majority of poor men, who are labourers or artisans. During the elections of 1885 and 1886, and at many by-elections, many hon. Members have been put to inconvenience in addressing their constituents, and some of us have been obliged to address them in the open air which, in these days of influenza, is inconvenient, and even dangerous. In my constituency, which includes 80 villages, there are only five places which I can hire to speak in. Precedents show that the State has taken upon itself the right of using these schools for public purposes when it pleases. It is not disputed that the use of these schoolrooms is often refused on unfair principles. But what is worse is, that they are often granted to one side of Political Parties, and denied to the other. If that should be

contradicted, I can quote the Vice President of the Council who, in 1887, in a reply given to myself, said he had discovered that hon. Members opposite were under special disadvantages as regarded meetings in rural districts. With regard to the Amendments which have been put upon the Paper, I think that standing in the name of the hon. Member for Shropshire will be found to be out of order, and that the Amendment of the Member for Wigan is unnecessary. There is an Amendment of the hon. Member for Oxford providing that the use of these rooms shall not be allowed "at the time of an election for a seat on the County Council, or in the Imperial Parliament." I do not see how you can carry out that Amendment, which makes no provision for the Member of Parliament to visit his constituents, and I believe that proposal is practically impossible. Hon. Members have to vote on the point whether a political Party wishes to gain an advantage over its opponents, and whether they will run the risk of it being said that the arguments of the other side are so powerful that they wish them not to be heard by the electors. I do not believe that that is the desire of hon. or right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, and holding this opinion I submit with confidence and hope my Resolution to the chivalrous instincts and sense of justice which I believe to be the common property of every section of the House.

(7.2.) MR. A. H. DYKE ACLAND (York, W.R., Rotherham) : It appears to me, Sir, that the managers of voluntary schools are taking this question into serious account, and there are different interpretations being put on the way schools are to be used. There are those who think these schools, receiving enormous sums of money from the State, are private property. The *School Guardian* says that the National Schools belong to the Church, and the fact that the State contributed to their erection does not affect the question of ownership and control. But the education given in these schools is largely provided for out of Imperial Votes. We say that the distinction you are always trying to make between taxes and rates is unreal. The public are providing

from 75 to 80 per cent. of the incomes of these schools, and it is reasonable that this large sum providing for the support of voluntary schools should carry some reasonable principle of local control. The same paper goes on to say—

"We think it would be wise of school managers to refuse the use of their schools for political meetings altogether."

That would mean practically the boycotting of all political meetings. The Vice President of the Council told us last year that he often attended political meetings, and had had to bolt from them.

SIR W. HART DYKE: Read the words. In large towns. In Erith in 1865.

MR. A. H. DYKE ACLAND: "I can assure hon. Members I have often had to bolt from the meeting." The question was raised by my hon. Friend the Member for Rugby, who proposed that village schools should be used for public purposes, when the right hon. Gentleman gave as one of the reasons for refusing his support that at these village meetings some of the audience misbehaved themselves. If the advice of papers like the *School Guardian* is followed we shall have no meetings at all, because there is no other place for either Party to meet in. Then we come to the stage of the clergyman, who refuses his school because he belongs to the other side. I have here a letter, dated the 27th October last, from Sir Walter Phillimore, in which he says the clergyman of a certain parish said—

"I and my friends are determined to do all in our power to prevent Gladstone playing tricks and drakes with Ireland. You cannot have it."

Then we have a much more modern stage. A letter from the Buckrose Division says—

"I am always willing to allow the use of our schools to candidates of either Party for the purpose of addressing the electors, but beyond this I do not feel disposed to go."

If that position were maintained in cases where the candidate could not go to the village more than once in four or five years, it would limit the occasions on which politics could be discussed to one single occasion in that

period. We can lay down no rule in this case unless we admit the broad principle that reasonable meetings for public and political purposes shall be allowed in these schools. The questions of temperance and labour are involved in the politics of the day, and are we to say that unless a member or candidate is present the villagers are not to have reasonably-conducted opportunities for authorities to address them on these questions? These village schools are being used for evening agricultural classes to help the farmer and allotment holder to get the knowledge how better to use his brain power and labour in the cultivation of the land. Are we not also to allow men to come to the labourer and teach him how best to use his capital—his labour? I think we should in these places have reasonable freedom for the discussion of social and political matters which directly concern the people in their relations to local and Imperial affairs. We shall be asked, Is this to apply to Board Schools? Most certainly. Everybody who knows anything of the North knows how valuable are the working men's co-operative societies in teaching thrift, the value of money, and the power of association. Why should a man be refused the use of the village Board School when he comes down to teach the villagers how to make a shilling go as far as possible by means of a co-operative society? In some cases at the last School Board Election the members were returned pledged to lend the school for such purposes, and now the meetings are held. In the next village the clergyman thinks co-operation is bad, and refuses the use of his school to the present day. That shows that School Boards can be dealt with, and can be dealt with by the villagers themselves in their own interests at least once in three years, and that these other schools, which have quite as large sums of Imperial money at their disposal cannot be dealt with by the villagers. The point about school managers is that many clergymen lend their schools willingly and heartily for every good purpose; they welcome the man who speaks about labour and about co-operation, and for good entertainments, whenever conducted by Non-

conformists or others, which will make the lives of the people better. But the point is that in the matter of private schools you have no security for permanence. One clergyman may so lend the school; but the clergyman who follows may take exactly the opposite view. This point should be carefully considered. The schools of this country last year received £3,000,000 from the State, and now receive more than £5,000,000. How, when many of these schools are not contributing 20 per cent. of the whole income of the schools, can you say that the people have no right to demand that their own public interests shall be considered? The Bishop of London said:—

“Every arrangement which treats the school as the people's own, and encourages the people to take a share in the management, will do at least as much service as the wisest advice and most skilful administration.”

Many of these schools have had money grants, and could not have carried on their work without them, and it is impossible to use the word “private” in the sense in which it is ordinarily used. I hope my hon. Friend's Motion will be taken in a wide sense; but we do not expect the Government to concede the schools for all the questions to which we have alluded. Politics are of a social character nowadays, and you must permit, by reasonable arrangement, discussion by the villagers of these social questions. There are the questions of friendly societies and old-age pensions, and we should encourage the villagers to meet Members of Parliament and discuss these questions. There should be hardly a night when the schools should not be lighted up, and something interesting going on, instead of being dark and shut up, because people are afraid of these alarming subjects which are placed before the town working-men every day of their lives. Let us do all we can in Parliament—responsible for these grants—to help forward the villagers in every way that lies in our power. Let us give the grants on condition that when the schools are not being used for night-classes they shall be used for every kind of meeting, political or social, which the inhabitants desire to be held in them. These are the very subjects on which we want

*Mr. A. H. Duke Acland*

more light and discussion. Is not insecurity enough already in the lives of many of our labourers, in the tenure of their cottages and things to inculcate a fear of speaking out. Can you not give them the security of hearing only both sides, but all sides, and treating them like children in every political and social question. Can we do much to lighten the burden of the labourer if we do all we can to brighten, instruct, and improve it. We do not do enough in that direction. Let us put the use to which we put our schools at present. Let the Government give the concession on a large basis, and the more generous the concession the more reasonable will be the use to which the schools are put. The greater the opportunity for education of the citizens, which opportunity we are bound to do our best to deny to the inhabitants of our districts.

#### Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word “That” at the end of the Question, in order to add the “taking into consideration the scarcity of buildings suitable for holding public meetings in rural districts, and the desirability that the electors of the Country should be enabled to hear both sides of questions affecting local and local interests, this House is of opinion that the schoolrooms in schools in receipt of Parliamentary grants on such occasions should not interfere with the educational purposes of the schools, and under the condition that the payment of all reasonable expenses by the members of the meeting, should be at the disposal of the inhabitants of the district in which the school is situated for the purpose of holding public meetings.”—(*Mr. H. Gardner*.)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, “That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.”

\*(7.20.) Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): hon. Member for Saffron Walden introduced his Resolution as if it were a Radical Candidates' Bill. It seems that these gentlemen are not able to find places in which to address their constituents, and so the hon. Member suggests that someone else should provide them. I have certain sympathy with the hon. Gentleman, for I have often had to speak in the open air and on the hillside

her places which are extremely inconvenient, and I should not object that candidates should have nice schools scattered all over their constituency, swept and garnished, in which they and congenial spirits might gather together. Let us put the question on the right lines. It is for the convenience of ourselves that we desire this appropriation, this invasion, so to speak, of the property of other people. The hon. Member for Saffron Walden begins by declaring the scarcity of convenient rooms in rural districts, and ends by claiming the schoolrooms everywhere, in towns as well as country. He declares it would be a great advantage to have political meetings in these rooms, and then, far from confining his Resolution to that, he ends by saying that every school shall be at the disposal of every two inhabitants of every district for the holding of all kinds of public meetings. What kind of public meetings? It is rather difficult to define a public meeting; his resolution would include socialist, Anarchist, and Fenian meetings, as well as bogus meetings of every description. And I suppose the hon. Member for Rotherham would not be quite happy if it excluded pipes and ale from the schoolroom.

MR. A. H. DYKE ACLAND: Smoking concerts.

\*MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON: I should be sorry for the schoolmaster the desire of the hon. Member was carried out, and there was a public meeting every night. How he is to carry on his school work under such circumstances I cannot conceive. Of the schools which the hon. Member desires to take, 9,600 have been built by private individuals by private subscriptions, without one farthing of public money, and £4,000,000 have been spent on them by private individuals. Now, hon. Members desire to get hold of these buildings, on the ground that a public grant is made for education; but I would point out that the grant does not apply to the construction of the schools at all. I have great sympathy with hon. Members; but surely their purpose is not educational. We can never allow that these schools are public property. The hon. Member ignored altogether the managers of the schools.

It is rather a strong measure for two inhabitants to override the freely elected representatives of the people—the School Board—to enter the school and put aside the wishes and regulations of the Board. I wish to make a suggestion, which I hope will be acceptable both to the Government and to hon. Members opposite. We are promised that a Bill shall be brought forward to exempt schools from rates, and I think we might add a clause to that Bill, under a proper definition, which will give, under reasonable conditions framed by the Department, the use of these rooms for political meetings.

\*(7.30.) MR. HENEAGE (Great Grimsby): I wish to support the Resolution of my hon. Friend in its most generous sense. I have always been a strong advocate for opening the schools for political and social purposes which will elevate the mind of the villagers in any way. I do not understand in moving this Resolution that we are trying to obtain the schools for ourselves as candidates or Members of Parliament. But we are doing it for the purpose of giving the parishioners in their own school district an opportunity of discussing the different sides of all questions. I also controvert the statement that these schools are entirely private schools. If these schools had not been built either by the landlords or private subscriptions, they would have had to been built out of the rates. Amongst those who so subscribed are many Non-conformists as well as many of those of the Church of England. Now that such large contributions are made out of the Imperial funds it is only fair that the schools should be used as far as possible for the benefit of the parishioners. In putting my verbal amendment to the Resolution it was with a view of giving them power which they do not possess under the Resolution as it stands. There will always be found—whatever the subject of the discussion may be—people ready to take the responsibility of calling and conducting the meeting, and this would give them power to hold meetings, and see that the parishioners are not kept out by people brought from other districts, which is often done. Those who ask for the room would have control of the meeting, and it would be in the first



instance for the benefit of those whose children attend the schools. I do not wish to restrict the use of the rooms to political and County Council meetings; I desire that they should be open for the discussion of every subject, social or political, Imperial or local, and as far as possible for entertainments which may elevate the minds of the parishioners. I hope the Government will accept this Resolution in the generous sense in which it is put on the Paper, then it will be dealt with by legislation, and we shall be able to discuss the details in the Bill. I cannot see what there is in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shropshire, unless it is that he desires to put in this Preamble to the effect that on behalf of the clergy he grudges giving the schools in these cases, but that, knowing that both sides are in favour of the Bill, he is willing to yield. I also regret the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Oxford University. That comes very badly from the Representative of the rural clergy, who has a quiet seat, and has never to go through the drudgery of Election speeches. If he really speaks the mind of the rural clergy, I am very sorry for it, but I do not believe it. If it is not, I think it very unfortunate that it should come from one who is here as special spokesman of them. I hope the House will not accept any Amendment, but that they will accept the Resolution in a generous sense, and not accept any limitations, but leave all details to be settled in a Bill.

(7.40.) MR. J. G. TALBOT (Oxford University): I do not claim to represent the rural clergy or the rural lawyers any more than the urban clergy or urban lawyers. I wish to explain why, and to what extent, I think it necessary to oppose the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman opposite. I should like to remark that these school buildings are primarily places for education; and secondly, and by accident, they become places of public meeting. I do not desire to offer a *non possumus*, but there is a danger in the natural desire to meet what is the very obvious wish on the part of many people, of forgetting what the schools exist chiefly for. In so far as we devote these buildings to other pur-

poses we run the risk of unfitting them for the purpose for which they were originally designed. They are to be used for political meetings, and these meetings sometimes degenerate into a certain amount of rowdyism—I do not say more at the meetings of one side than the other—there is a good deal of disturbance, and the furniture gets rather knocked about. That is not a convenient condition for school buildings to be reduced to. One hon. Member suggested that smoking concerts should be permitted. The effects of smoking overnight do not always disappear with the night, and those effects, I suppose, would be an uncomfortable adjunct to education. These buildings are, under present circumstances, often used for evening technical education lectures. Suppose the parishioners claimed the schoolroom for a public meeting, what is to prevent, unless the Bill is very carefully drafted, the lectures being disturbed by the political meeting, which the parishioners have a right to demand? Hon. Members will see that this is a question which cannot be disposed of by an after-dinner discussion, but is one which really needs careful attention, which I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will give to it. The hon. Gentleman who moves this Resolution says—

“Under the condition of payment of all reasonable expenses by the conveners of the meeting.”

Has the hon. Gentleman thought these words out? They are very nice, but how is he going to carry them out? The conveners of the meeting will be the inhabitants of the village, but how are they going to pay the expenses? The managers have to maintain the schools in a fit state every day to secure the grant. Suppose the room is upset by a rowdy meeting, and some of the chairs and desks are broken; who is going to make good the damage? Who is going to ensure that the room is in a proper state the next morning for its primary use? These points want very careful watching. If these meetings are to go on all night, and every night throughout the year—

MR. HENEAGE: Not all night.

Mr. Heneage

**MR. J. G. TALBOT:** The speaker's sequence might be exhaustive and others might want to answer it, and there might be a regular Parliamentary debate. If that is to be the case I do not know where we shall be led. We must put a limit to their use, and I thought they might be used for Parliamentary and County Council election purposes only, and then my right hon. Friend might rescue them from his wisdom from the dangers they have endeavoured to point out. I am sorry that the occasion has arisen for this Motion at all. Such matters should be arranged by co-operation one with another. I suppose there may be unreasonable clergymen, though I have not often come across them; yet if there are unreasonable people, I suppose the House must do something to meet the difficulty. I do not think there was any large demand made for this; but if we are going to deal with it, I hope it will be carefully done. As it must be done by Bill, I suppose we shall soon have an opportunity of discussing it. We know the Government have a very large programme before them, though how much of it they can fulfil I do not know. I have great confidence in them, but I do not think adding another Bill to that programme will help them through. As we are going to have one Education Bill for exempting school buildings from rates, that affords a good opportunity for adding a clause on this subject, and the two were dealt with together it might conduce to a saving of public time.

\*(7.50.) **THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL** (Sir W. HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): I hope I have not intervened too soon; but I am anxious, before hon. Members separate, to put my views and the views of the Government before the House with regard to this Resolution. The speeches of both the Mover and Seconder were perfect models of what a speech should be on a Resolution of this kind. There was no evidence of an intention on their part to stir up Party strife. I must be allowed, in the first instance, to say one word on the part of the Department which I have the honour to represent. So far as my own opinion goes, I have

always expressed a great regret that there should be any necessity for holding political meetings in our schools. I am not alone in holding that view; it is held, I know, by many hon. Members opposite. Still more do I entertain this regret in view of the changes we have made in regard to our elementary schools. I trust I am not over-sanguine in hoping that the changes we have made and the better position in which we have placed rural schools will induce managers—especially in respect of the newer branches of education in which amusement is mingled with instruction—to adopt the system of evening classes, which is one of the most prominent features of these changes. In 1887 the matter was brought before the House, and the hon. Member for Leicester said that just in proportion as these buildings were well adapted for school purposes, and furnished for that end, just to that extent they were ill-adapted for public meetings. But we have this evening to meet the case which is put before us, and my duty on behalf of the Government is to say that I am prepared to concede this point. We have a great difficulty in regard as to how and where public meetings are to be held in rural districts. I myself have had some lengthened experience of public meetings. The hon. Member for Rotherham has referred to a more unfortunate phase of my experience. What I had in my mind when I spoke happened a long time ago, and hon. Members may congratulate themselves that we have now a more peaceful state of things. Not many years ago I had the painful experience of being invited to attend the meeting of a political opponent in his own hop kiln. Hon. Members will appreciate the dangerous position I occupied when I felt all the while that my opponent might at any time light the fire, and while drying his hops might dry up his opponent. It is perfectly obvious from the speech of all hon. Members that we have a great difficulty in regard to these meetings, and we are all agreed that we should wish all to share alike in regard to these schoolrooms—either that they should not be used at all or else be at the disposal of either Party. Cases have been shown where schools have been

lent to one Party and denied to the other. Then we come to the proposal of the hon. Member. Although I know that during last Session I refused to import an Amendment with reference to this matter into the Education Bill then passed, I think I can with some justice—it is scarcely worth while to go into the reasons—press the view that it would have been hazardous for me, considering that the Bill I was dealing with was bristling with contentious matters, to attempt to graft such a proposal on the Bill. Yet I wish to assure hon. Members that I was during that discussion impressed with the fact that this was not a difficulty which was felt on one side of the House only. I found several Members on this side, both during the discussion and afterwards, pressing seriously upon me the fact that a great difficulty—especially in the Eastern Counties—was met in regard to public meetings in schools. Since that time I have gone into the matter, and have come to the conclusion that, owing to the extraordinary growth in the speech-making power of the country, this was a difficulty that must be met. I calculated that for every speech made in 1865 there were now a hundred. Putting all these facts together, and acknowledging as the Government must do that there is a real grievance to meet as regards the supply of places for political meetings, I wish to state, on behalf of the Government, that we are prepared to fully accept the principle embodied in this Resolution. Sir, having said so much, and without going closely into the speeches of the Proposer and Seconder of the Resolution, I think it only fair, for many reasons, to urge one or two considerations upon the House with regard to this question. It has been urged by my hon. Friend that this is not an easy question to deal with, and that there are grave difficulties in regard to the matter. But they are difficulties which I believe, with a little give and take on both sides of the House, can be fairly and adequately met. But I should be wrong if I did not mention one or two points for the consideration of hon. Members. In the first place, I should like to urge this point on hon. Members: The Resolution as it stands

*Sir W. Hart Dyke*

demands that these schoolrooms shall be at the disposal of the inhabitants of the district where the school is situated. This points to the intention that the demands should come, and ought to come, from the locality. I am of opinion that this demand should come from a certain number of the ratepayers of the locality, or other responsible persons. I think that some such provision as this is necessary in regard to these schools. Much has been made, and I think very fairly made, in previous discussions, of the difficulty of the damage which might be done to schools. Under the circumstances I think it would be perfectly useless for us to discuss that point. All of us who have any experience of these things know that damage may occur. That is a great matter, because it involves this: that security should be given that any damage that was done should at once be put right, and it also raises the difficult point with regard to the description of the meetings held in the schools. I think we ought to have some security that a candidate can only summon a meeting through the ratepayer in the locality; and as regards any damage that may be done, I think that security should also be given, and that such damage should also be made good at once. I think it should also be understood that the right can only be claimed where very considerable pains have been taken to discover a suitable building and where a suitable building cannot be found. I would further point out that it is the interest of the locality that this should be done. There may be cases of schools being taken for a meeting where the building may be filled with people coming from other parishes to the exclusion of the inhabitants of the locality. Well, then, I think the manager should be protected not only as regards the actual hours during which a meeting of the school may be held, but in a case such as this. Supposing a demand is made for the occupation of a school for a public meeting on a certain date, and then following this meeting an inspection of that school is to take place. Here a very great difficulty may arise. The inspection usually takes place in the early morning, and

a noisy meeting might place the manager in a very great difficulty as regards the inspection of that school. I think we should, therefore, see that some protection should be given to the manager, and that he should have some right of appeal to the Education Department or some responsible body. I think I need not detain the House further. I think due notice should be given; and I can only conclude these few remarks by saying that I think it would be well that these difficulties should be met in a fair and a generous spirit on both sides of the House, and I hope the concession I have made will be appreciated by hon. Members.

(8.5.) MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): I am quite sure that the concession which has been made by the right hon. Gentleman will be received in every quarter of the House in the way it deserves. The right hon. Gentleman could not have taken up a new position with better humour or better grace. I will not go for a moment into the reasons he gave for justifying the attitude he has now taken up. It would be ungracious for me to do that; and I may state that it is enough for us that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government are prepared, to use the right hon. Gentleman's own language, "to the full" to accept the principle of this Amendment. The qualifications, if qualifications they may be called, are really not worth quarrelling about. In fact, many of them—the important ones—are already embodied in the Resolution. The proposal that the demand should be made by a certain number—it should be a very small number—of responsible persons, is by no means an unreasonable one; and I have to remind him that my hon. Friend the Member for Lotherham admitted that the test of the kind of meeting that ought to be held, as regards the character of the meeting, was to be found in the sense of the inhabitants of the districts. As regards this last point, as to the reasonableness of notice being given, of course, in the case of all meetings of this kind, that must be recognized. As for the apprehensions expressed faintly by the right hon. Gentleman, but loudly by the hon. Member for the University of Oxford, both of them seemed

to forget that schools are used every week of the year for political meetings. When the hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Oxford talked about danger to the furniture, and of the difficulty of the place being put in order early next day, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council observed that the Inspector might arrive next morning and find the room not quite ready, and so forth, all this would apply to schools which all of us who represent boroughs know are open every week of the year. That is to say, we hold our meetings in Board Schools, and the next morning the school work goes on exactly as if these meetings had never been held. All these apprehensions are purely imaginary; and I only regret for the sake of the position of the University of Oxford that the Member for that body, which I, as a humble member of it, of course wish well as much as the hon. Member himself, should come forward to take up this position. But as the Government have not followed him in that very obnoxious line, I shall say nothing more about it, only to point out this: that his own Amendment, if accepted by the House, would have left all these dangers for several months previous to an election. The right hon. Gentleman said—and this was almost the only point which I thought he was not reasonable in—he said that the inhabitants should satisfy themselves that they should not come and demand the schools unless they were persuaded that it was the last resort. Well, I do not think that any such necessity should be laid upon the inhabitants. We all know very well what is the place of last resort; that would be the public-house; but does the right hon. Gentleman mean that meetings should be held in a public-house rather than in a school?

SIR W. HART DYKE: What I really wished to impress upon the House was that they should only use a school when they could not get a better place, and that every possible pains should be taken by them to get a better place if possible.

MR. J. MORLEY: I quite accept the right hon. Gentleman's explanation; and I am sure that the persons con-

cerned will take care to find a better place if they can. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to limit the use of the schools by talking about the Parliamentary candidate as being the only person who could use these schools. I hope that he, and I hope that the Government, will fall in with the wishes expressed by the hon. Member for Rotherham, and that all subjects of political and social interest would be discussed at meetings in these schoolrooms—temperance, friendly societies, co-operation. Persons wishing to discuss all subjects of that kind, if a sufficient number of the inhabitants wish to discuss them, should be allowed to do so, and I hope that all these schools, supported by public money, will be open to the people. It is a very important concession that is made. It will make a great difference in rural life, and after the night now passing I hope we shall never more hear any of the nonsense about these schools being private property.

\* COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): Sir, whilst I am not opposed to school buildings in rural parishes being used for public meetings and for entertainments, I am, at the same time, most anxious that the Vice President should specially consider the peculiar position in which the Church schools stand. I mean school rooms which are also used as churches. The circumstances of these schools are different from those of the ordinary elementary schools, and it is not at all impossible that if they were thrown open, as is proposed by this Resolution, at the instance of several householders, they may be used for the purpose of entertainments that may justly be held to give offence to the congregation of the Church. Therefore, Sir, I would suggest either that the Church schools should be exempted—perhaps that would be desirable in any case—from the Resolution, or that, in case of objection being taken, power should be given to the managers of referring any application to the Inspectors or to a local Magistrate. The effect of that would be to check any possible abuse.

*Mr. J. Morley*

\*(9.48.) MR. T. H. BOLTON (St. Pancras, N.): I understand that the Government have, in principle, assented to the Resolution of my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden. The object of my rising is, therefore, not to prolong the discussion, but to direct attention to the terms of the Resolution. In the Preamble the Resolution recites that there is a scarcity of conveniences for the holding of public meetings in rural districts, and the Resolution goes on to say that, in the opinion of the House, schoolrooms should be made available for the purpose of public meetings. Sir, taking these two parts of the Resolution it might be suggested that the want of adequate accommodation, and the necessity of supplying it, were alike confined to the rural districts. That is not so. I quite admit the case of the rural districts, but in many of the cities and large towns the case is quite as strong. In my own constituency, for example, namely, North St. Pancras, in Gospel Oak district, the only good room available for public meetings is a Church schoolroom, the use of which, for reasons I will not comment upon, has been denied to myself and to my friends. Some rule has been made that the room is not to be used for political purposes, and, as a consequence, I have not had an opportunity of holding a meeting of my constituents in that particular district. The only large room available in the whole neighbourhood is a room on the border of my constituency, for which a considerable fee is charged. The inconvenience arising from the want of suitable places for the holding of public meetings is felt in many other parts of the Metropolis. Therefore, Sir, I hope that when the right hon. Gentleman considers how to give practical effect to my hon. Friend's proposal he will not confine his attention to the rural districts, but that he will likewise consider the claims of the Metropolis, and of the populous towns throughout the country to similar accommodation.

\*(8.55.) VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen): Sir, although I sympathise very greatly with my hon. Friend opposite, the Member for Saffron Walden, I, at

at the same time, think that a certain amount of sympathy should be extended to the managers of the rural and voluntary schools—sympathy with the sentiment they profess, and with the action they have thought it right to take. For my own part, I think that the managers of the voluntary schools would, on the whole, have acted more wisely if they had agreed that both Political Parties should have practically a free hearing before the constituencies. At the same time, the House should remember the circumstances under which these schools are built. Nearly two-thirds of the whole of the voluntary schools were built without a penny of assistance from the State—built by clergymen and churchmen interested in a particular form of education—namely, the education of the poor in the principles of the Church of England. Now, Sir, although I think the managers have behaved unwisely, I cannot but sympathise with them in their feelings of reluctance to permit the schools which they built to maintain the Church of England being used to destroy it. Take a parallel case—the Volunteers—who are maintained wholly by public funds. Supposing it were suggested that the drill halls belonging to the Volunteers, which have been put up by private subscriptions, should be available for public meetings when any six gentlemen of the parish might so desire, and supposing that these meetings might take the form of a denunciation of the volunteer system and their commanding officers. I think the Volunteers in this House would take care to make themselves effectively heard in opposition to any such proposal. I think they would be wrong. I think it would be better if they allowed the meetings; still, you could not hold them illogical if they said they would not allow buildings erected for the purpose of fostering the Volunteer movement being used to denounce it. Now, Sir, I understand the Government have accepted the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite. I think they are wise in so doing; but they must carefully consider the regulations under which meetings are to be held. Precautions must be taken that

those who have the use of the schools can give a substantial guarantee against loss. But, if proper precautions were taken, I do not think any harm would accrue to voluntary schools; but I do not think any Resolution, or Bill consequent upon it, ought to be carried unless such precautions were taken.

(9.7.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I always hear the noble Lord speak upon this subject with great satisfaction, because I look upon him as a Representative of an almost extinct species—I mean the old Tory. In fact, his accents come upon us almost like distant music, and remind us of the Lost Chord. The noble Lord said they had created these schools for the purpose of extending the interest of the Church of England; but ever since the passing of the Elementary Education Bill of 1887 they ought to have perceived that there was no longer a legitimate purpose to which these schools should be appropriated. Although very reasonable views on this subject had been taken in this House, I have no doubt that there would be a great many people outside who would still adhere to the view that the village school is primarily to be used for the maintenance of the views and interests of the Church. But that is not the fact since the Elementary Education Act and those large grants were passed. I think Gentlemen on both sides of the House regard with favour the idea that the rural population shall have opportunities of instruction and interest. The noble Lord speaks of this matter as if it were a question of Party politics. But that is not our view, for we think it is not to be restricted to political meetings by any means, and what we contemplate is that the schoolroom should be the village hall, as the town-hall is the place of meeting in the town. There is generally in a village one building alone—unless you wish people to go to the public-house, which is the last place it is desirable they should use for the purpose—which is available for public meetings, and we contemplate that they should meet there when they have any question to discuss, whether they want allotments, or a Small Holdings Bill, or similar subjects; and where can the village community more

properly meet to consider them than in a village school? Take again the question of temperance. There are many questions affecting village life, apart from Party politics, for which I desire there should be a free use of village schools, as the regular meeting place for the discussion of subjects apart from Party affairs. The noble Lord is very much afraid of the damage that may be caused at Party elections; but in the large towns we are perfectly familiar with these meetings for all sorts of purposes, and above all for Party purposes, and nobody hears of those mischiefs arising which give him so much alarm. As for safeguards, the noble Lord belongs to the Party of safeguards; but, generally speaking, when their safeguards come to be examined, they are either very unnecessary or totally inapplicable. The safeguards advocated to-night are mostly superfluous, and everything the noble Lord has been contending for in that respect is contained in the Resolution. Therefore, I hope the Bill will be accepted in a liberal spirit, and not in the narrow view which has been expressed on the opposite side.

(9.15.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the fact of a large contribution made by the State towards the elementary education carried on in the schools does differentiate them, to a certain extent, from ordinary private schools erected and solely maintained by private enterprise; but at the same time it is perfectly certain, as my noble Friend behind me has said, that these schools, in a large number of cases, have been erected at the cost of a certain section of the community, in order that religious education may be carried on in accordance with their particular creed. That is a fact that should not be lost sight of whenever this Resolution comes to be embodied in a Bill. In fact, I do not think it is possible to describe the discussion of this evening as more than a Second Reading Debate upon the principle of the proposal. We are all agreed, on both sides of the House, that it is in the highest degree desirable that those schools, in districts where no other

public places of assembly are to be obtained, should be open to every side of politics to be used for the amelioration of the life of the inhabitants of the district. But I confess that I have an uneasy feeling that when the hon. Gentleman opposite comes to embody this view in his Bill, he will find that he has to take more trouble in devising the safeguards which the right hon. Gentleman has derided than he at present supposes. My noble Friend has pointed out that if damage occurs to these schools the cost should be defrayed by the people who engage them, and not by the managers of the schools, and the equity of that proposition, I am sure, will be recognised by Gentlemen opposite. I notice that the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman applies to Ireland as much as to Scotland and England, and it is obvious that it must apply to Ireland, inasmuch as every argument used with regard to England applies with tenfold force to Ireland. But I think hon. Gentlemen should be very careful lest they should give a power to any street lecturer on social or political subjects to make use of convent schools in Ireland—which receive grants very much in excess of the amount given in the English schools—for purposes which those who assist in their management would disapprove of. In the North of Ireland, where the religious sects are equally divided, I can conceive that very considerable security against damage would be required in some cases by the managers of schools. When the hon. Gentleman comes to frame his Bill with safeguards for the managers of schools against all the dangers which have been pointed out his task will be very difficult. I shall be glad when the time comes that he can bring forward his Bill. In the meantime, I trust the result of this discussion, although it can have no obligatory force until its effect is embodied in a Bill, will have some influence in inducing every manager of a school to open it, so far as he can, to the expression of any legitimate opinion on the other side of politics, and I believe that the vast majority of them are now prepared to do so for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of existence of the people in their locality.

*Sir William Harcourt*

9.24.) MR. HERBERT GARDNER: Perhaps I may be allowed to know the acceptance of the resolution by Her Majesty's Government, but I find that the words of the order of the House do not agree with those of the Vice President—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has no right of reply, as there is no Amendment before the House.

(9.25.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, Co. Dub.): I notice an observation of the First Lord of the Treasury with regard to Ireland. We have not intervened in this Debate because we have waited to see what position would be taken by Her Majesty's Ministers, but the right hon. Gentleman who spoke on behalf of the Government has now said it would be the duty of the hon. Member for Saffron Walden to introduce a Bill, whereas we gathered from the previous speech of the Minister of Education that it was the intention of the Government to do so themselves.

MR. W. HART DYKE: I think there must be some misapprehension. I do not think I said anything implying that the Government would introduce a Bill.

MR. HEALY: The hon. Member for Saffron Walden has no power of carrying a Bill if it were to be opposed and blocked by hon. Members opposite. Of course, we feel in Ireland that this is a matter of some delicacy, and I do not at all wish to say that our minds are made up on the subject. What I would suggest to Her Majesty's Government is that the Government should instruct the Irish Education Board to draw up certain rules which, in their opinion, would define the limits of deviation with regard to the subjects to be discussed at meetings of these schools.

(9.30.) MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, Co. Dub.): So far as Ireland is concerned with this question, I must say it is not to us a very practical one. So much interest is taken with us in political affairs, and the meetings would be usually so large, so many people desire to attend them, that it would be practically impossible to use school buildings in rural districts, as they would not be large enough to

afford accommodation. Therefore, the question does not interest us much until we see the proposals of the Government; but I feel bound to protest against the suggestion made by the First Lord of the Treasury. The First Lord, after the Resolution was accepted on behalf of the Government, stands up and speaks of a Bill being brought in by the hon. Member for the Saffron Walden Division to carry that Resolution into effect. Although I am but a comparatively new Member of the House, I am surprised, I confess, at the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman. I thought it was settled, as one of the established customs of the House that if a Government accepts a Resolution, the acceptance of which would be nothing but a mockery and a form if it were not carried out in substance, it is the duty of the Government to make that Resolution effective by bringing in a Bill upon the subject. I believe it is a fact that every Member of the House accepts that doctrine. The Government having agreed to the Resolution ought themselves to introduce a Bill. All the Wednesdays up to Easter have already been appropriated by private Members, and what chance, I ask, would the hon. Member for Saffron Walden have if he were to introduce a Bill? In fact, it would be practically impossible for him to carry it. We know that a number of Members of this House will not be likely to agree with the hon. Member for Saffron Walden in all the details of the measure, so that we know the measure will be ruined if the Government refuse to initiate legislation, and that they will be turning their acceptance of the Resolution into a nullity. I appeal to the desire for British fair play, and ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is not himself aware that he is departing from the customs of the House with regard to this Resolution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As a matter of personal explanation, I wish to say that I accept every word that has fallen from the Vice President of the Council. One very strong reason why the Government cannot undertake to introduce a Bill, is that we think we may have difficulty in passing the measures already introduced, and therefore it would be



just as much a mockery if we were to introduce it without a chance of passing it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: As the right hon. Gentleman has given no explanation, I think we should have one. I certainly understood the Vice President of the Council to say that he would bring in a Bill.

SIR W. HART DYKE: If the right hon. Gentleman can quote a single sentence in my speech to that effect I shall be glad to hear it.

(9.34.) MR. F. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): It is perfectly clear that there is a discrepancy between the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury and that of the Vice President of the Council. We certainly did understand from the speech of the Vice President of the Council that the Government would bring in a Bill.

SIR W. HART DYKE: I cannot admit anything of the kind.

MR. F. STEVENSON: I think, Mr. Speaker, that where the schools are in receipt of a grant out of the Imperial Exchequer these buildings ought to be serviceable as town-halls or village-halls, to be used for the purpose of political meetings. There are only three courses to be pursued. The first is, that the Member for Saffron Walden Division should bring in a Bill himself dealing with the question. That is practically impossible, and I think it would be a shame if the Government were to accept this Resolution and leave the matter in its present stage without any legislation on the subject. Considering the number of Bills that are down by private Members, it has little chance of securing a place, and even if it did secure a place there would be no chance of passing it into law. So far, therefore, as the first course is concerned, I believe it to be out of the question, and I think hon. Members will agree with me. The second course is that the Bill should have special precedence given to it, but the third is, I think, a practical one; it is that a clause be introduced into the Rating of Schools Bill, giving the power of holding political meetings in school rooms. I do not see the object of the Government accepting a Resolution that cannot be possibly carried out. There is no meaning in it; and I think

the best course would be, as has been suggested, to bring in a clause in the Rating of Schools Bill, adopting the course that has been so generally recommended. Should the Government refuse to adopt that course, it will remain for hon. Members upon this side of the House, when they have a majority in the next Parliament, to put in force the terms of the Resolution.

(9.40.) MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I am bound to say that as I left the House a short time ago I was under the distinct impression, from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council, that the Government undertook to give legislative effect to the Resolution.

SIR W. HART DYKE: Can you quote any single sentence in my speech to justify that conclusion? In the interest of fair-play, I ask the hon. Member to quote any sentence from my speech that will bear any such interpretation; that the Government either directly or indirectly pledged itself to bring in a Bill.

MR. CHANNING: Well, I cannot carry my mind back to the exact words, but the impression left upon my mind was that the Government would bring in a Bill to deal with the question. I think this is a question of great importance in view of the General Election, which cannot be much longer delayed, and I think it is perfectly clear that Her Majesty's Government intends to run away from the opinion they have definitely endorsed in the course of the Debate. It is obvious that since the speech of the Vice President of the Council there has been some consultation in other parts of the House, and it is also evident that the irritation of some noble Lords and hon. Gentlemen opposite, who sit behind the Treasury Bench, has been assuaged by an assurance that the Government does not intend to be in earnest in this matter; that they have no intention of carrying the Resolution into effect; that the Debate is to be reduced to an ignoble farce, and that the Resolution which they have adopted is to be relegated to the region of pious opinions.

(9.45.) MR. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Harrow): Supposing the Resolution passed it would be necessary to

introduce this Bill, and what I understand the Government has done is to edge itself that if such a Bill were introduced they would support it. But it appears to me to be impossible to intend that that involves a pledge on the part of the Government to introduce this Bill this Session to give legislative effect to this Resolution, thereby discharging all the other Business to which it is already committed. I take it that the Government, having accepted this Resolution, will afford every facility to its Members to carry it into effect, and that they will give every reasonable facility for the carrying out of their wishes as contained in the Resolution before the House.

(9.50.) MR. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Liberal): I should like to know what are the intentions of Her Majesty's Government upon this question. I have listened to the speeches made on the part of the Government, and to the announcement of the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council, but I confess I do not yet know where we are. Is this Resolution to be given effect to, or is it not? The Government has accepted it, and I hold that, according to all precedent, they are bound, having accepted it, to introduce legislation upon the subject.

(9.55.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, Liberal): I hope if the Government accept this Resolution—and I have no doubt, after the promise of the Government, a Bill will be introduced on the subject—they will have some consideration for the position of convent schools. I hope these schools will be exempted from the scope of this Bill, which I have no doubt the Government will introduce, being the way in which they have treated this Resolution. I wish to point out that there was a similar clause in the Ballot Bill, but it was struck out by the House of Lords, and to do the Tory Party justice it should be said that they rose in arms against the action of the Lords upon that occasion. The Government has accepted this Resolution, and I think it would not be creditable if a Bill were not introduced this Session dealing with the question.

(10.0.) MR. ROBY (Lancashire, E., Eccles): I understand that

VOL. I.      [NEW SERIES.]

the Motion is accepted by the Government, and I, therefore, wish to give notice that upon the Amendment becoming a substantive Resolution, I shall move the addition of the following words:—

“And that it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to give effect to this opinion by legislation.”

It seems to me that this is the only proper course to adopt in connection with this matter, and that it is the only way in which the Resolution can be carried into effect.

\*(10.5.) THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets): I must confess that there never was, to my mind, a more extraordinary course taken than that taken by the hon. Members opposite. The Resolution has been accepted by the Government, and, as a rule, the ordinary course pursued by the Government would have ended the discussion. For my part, I do not believe that after a Resolution of this kind has been proposed and carried with the assent of the Government, that there would be the smallest difficulty in connection with it. It has been suggested that the Government should at once bring in a Bill dealing with the matter, but I see not the slightest difficulty in dealing with the question, now that the Resolution has been accepted. There never was a more complete offer made by any Government. Hon. Members opposite are asked to bring forward a Bill to give effect to their Resolution, and the Government go further by saying that they will give any such Bill their entire support. Such an offer, I think, is a most generous one; but if the House desires to impose upon the Government the responsibility of setting aside some of the most important measures that have been proposed to the House, that is not a responsibility that the Government is prepared to accept. The Session is yet young, and we believe there will be no difficulty with the hon. Gentleman bringing forward a Bill to give effect to his Resolution. If such a Bill is brought forward the Government will support it, and do their utmost to pass it; and I cannot see what more can be

properly meet to consider them than in a village school? Take again the question of temperance. There are many questions affecting village life, apart from Party politics, for which I desire there should be a free use of village schools, as the regular meeting place for the discussion of subjects apart from Party affairs. The noble Lord is very much afraid of the damage that may be caused at Party elections; but in the large towns we are perfectly familiar with these meetings for all sorts of purposes, and above all for Party purposes, and nobody hears of those mischiefs arising which give him so much alarm. As for safeguards, the noble Lord belongs to the Party of safeguards; but, generally speaking, when their safeguards come to be examined, they are either very unnecessary or totally inapplicable. The safeguards advocated to-night are mostly superfluous, and everything the noble Lord has been contending for in that respect is contained in the Resolution. Therefore, I hope the Bill will be accepted in a liberal spirit, and not in the narrow view which has been expressed on the opposite side.

(9.15.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the fact of a large contribution made by the State towards the elementary education carried on in the schools does differentiate them, to a certain extent, from ordinary private schools erected and solely maintained by private enterprise; but at the same time it is perfectly certain, as my noble Friend behind me has said, that these schools, in a large number of cases, have been erected at the cost of a certain section of the community, in order that religious education may be carried on in accordance with their particular creed. That is a fact that should not be lost sight of whenever this Resolution comes to be embodied in a Bill. In fact, I do not think it is possible to describe the discussion of this evening as more than a Second Reading Debate upon the principle of the proposal. We are all agreed, on both sides of the House, that it is in the highest degree desirable that those schools, in districts where no other

public places of assembly are to be obtained, should be open to every side of politics to be used for the amelioration of the life of the inhabitants of the district. But I confess that I have an uneasy feeling that when the hon. Gentleman opposite comes to embody this view in his Bill, he will find that he has to take more trouble in devising the safeguards which the right hon. Gentleman has derided than he at present supposes. My noble Friend has pointed out that if damage occurs to these schools the cost should be defrayed by the people who engage them, and not by the managers of the schools, and the equity of that proposition, I am sure, will be recognised by Gentlemen opposite. I notice that the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman applies to Ireland as much as to Scotland and England, and it is obvious that it must apply to Ireland, inasmuch as every argument used with regard to England applies with tenfold force to Ireland. But I think hon. Gentlemen should be very careful lest they should give a power to any street lecturer on social or political subjects to make use of convent schools in Ireland—which receive grants very much in excess of the amount given in the English schools—for purposes which those who assist in their management would disapprove of. In the North of Ireland, where the religious sects are equally divided, I can conceive that very considerable security against damage would be required in some cases by the managers of schools. When the hon. Gentleman comes to frame his Bill with safeguards for the managers of schools against all the dangers which have been pointed out his task will be very difficult. I shall be glad when the time comes that he can bring forward his Bill. In the meantime, I trust the result of this discussion, although it can have no obligatory force until its effect is embodied in a Bill, will have some influence in inducing every manager of a school to open it, so far as he can, to the expression of any legitimate opinion on the other side of politics, and I believe that the vast majority of them are now prepared to do so for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of existence of the people in their locality.

*Sir William Harcourt*

on us, and, under all the circumstances, I feel compelled to move the adjournment of the Debate.

The Question was not put.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to move at the Question be now put.

MR. PHILIPPS: I move that the question be put.

MR. SPEAKER: The original Question was that I do now leave the Chair.

(10.26.) MR. WILLIAM LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): Having voted in favour of this Motion on former occasions, I am glad the Government have accepted the Resolution that has been placed before the House. I, therefore, see nothing worth while fighting about. As the manager of a country school, I have to say that I have found no difficulty in allowing opposing Parties to use the school and air their opinions as they think proper. The result of the arrangement has been most beneficial to the village and to the district with which I am connected. It seems to me to be unreasonable to force the Government upon short notice to add the important measures already in their programme by including a Bill embodying the Resolution now before the House. Why could not the hon. Member bring in a Bill himself? Nobody will block its passage, and I hope at the hon. Member will bring forward the matter. I, for one, shall heartily glad to support him.

(10.28.) SIR E. BIRKBECK (Norfolk, N.): I have to thank the Government, on behalf of the Eastern Counties, for what they have done in regard to the Resolution of the hon. Member. But is it to be understood that the Government, in adopting it, are to introduce a Bill embodying it, and so to set aside the Small Holdings Bill and other measures that they have undertaken?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: As the hon. Member has raised the question, I can save some time by saying that the Government were obliged to an Educational Rating Bill of their own, and I should like to know whether the First Lord will insert a clause giving practical effect to this resolution? No other business would

thus be set aside; on the contrary, the Government would be making this Resolution and its fulfilment part of their own business.

SIR E. BIRKBECK: The right hon. Gentleman is entirely mistaken if he imagines that I and my hon. Friends are going to allow a Bill like the Small Holdings Bill to be put aside in favour of such a measure as this. We intend to stick firmly to our guns upon this subject. I ask hon. Members opposite to quote some precedent in support of the action which the supporters of the Resolution have taken.

(10.29.) MR. SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich): I have to express my appreciation of the manner in which the Government has dealt with the Resolution. I have some knowledge of country life and of electioneering, and I have always found it to be a great grievance that the use of schools was allowed to one Party and not to another. It is most desirable that some change should be introduced, and I am, therefore, particularly glad to hear the views of the Vice President of the Council. Since legislation was necessary I should like to see it given effect to without delay. I am, however, not surprised that the Government should hesitate to undertake the responsibility of bringing in another Bill. I had hoped that the hon. Member would have brought in a Bill himself, but as an Educational Rating Bill is about to be brought in by the Government, I wish to know whether it is not possible for the Government to bring in a clause giving effect to this Resolution?

(10.30.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A number of appeals have been made to Her Majesty's Government from several quarters of the House, and this circumstance will, perhaps, serve as my excuse for asking permission for again interfering in the discussion. Unfortunately the speech which I delivered an hour-and-a-half ago was heard by a comparatively thin House, and I think few hon. Members now present are really aware of the original cause of the present dispute. I expressed my hope on the part of the Government that the Resolution and the Debate which had taken place might have an effect upon every

desired, unless there is some purpose behind which is not quite apparent to our understanding. In fact, it would really seem as if hon. Members opposite were disappointed at the frankness with which the Government has met this Resolution, and the readiness they have shown to meet the proposals of the hon. Member.

(10.10.) MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire): I think that by accepting this Resolution the Government has taken upon itself a new responsibility. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has again and again laid down the principle that a Government ought not to accept an abstract Resolution unless they saw their way to carry it into effect. I think the Government ought either to have made some definite announcement that they will deal with the matter this Session, or otherwise they should have opposed the Resolution. I believe many Members left the House under this impression before the dinner hour, and that the large majority of Members believe that the Government has pledged itself to carry out the terms of the Resolution.

\*(10.15.) MR. WILLIAM GEORGE AINSLIE (Lancashire, N. Lonsdale): It appears to me unfair that the right hon. Gentleman should be asked to bring forward a Bill embodying the Resolution because that Resolution has been adopted by the House. I do not see that this involves the Government in any responsibility in regard to the bringing in of a Bill. If the Government are going to deal with these properties they will surely either have to purchase them or rent them, and in regard to purchase I do not know how it can be done, as there is no one to whom the purchase money could be handed over. As to renting, it rests with Local Authorities, and I believe there is sufficient public spirit in existence to deal with the matter. At the same time, I do say that the managers of these schools should do all they could to facilitate the holding of popular meetings in country districts.

\*(10.20.) MR. RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester): An hon. Member has said that the Government has run away from its undertaking in respect to the

opening of village schoolrooms for public meetings. Now I do not see how the Government can be charged with running away from its pledges, and I think the hon. Member opposite could be equally charged with absolutely shrinking from the terms of the Resolution which has been proposed. In fact instead of the Government running away from its pledges it is the hon. Member for Saffron Walden who is running away from his. It has plainly been indicated by the Government that they will support a Bill if it were brought in dealing with the subject, and I think, therefore, it rests with the hon. Member to bring forward some proposal for legislation, and that the responsibility does not lie with the Government. There is time at the disposal of private Members, but not of the Government, already over-burdened. Safeguards, too, are needed in a Bill relating to that voluntary system which has done so much for the country.

(10.24.) MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I have listened with great interest to the Debate, and I heartily concur in the proposal of the hon. Member for Saffron Walden Division. I beg to thank the Government for having so cordially and rightly accepted the Motion of the hon. Member; but in the last few minutes I have noticed an attempt to play off one of those smart little dodges which has been resorted to once or twice in the present Session. An attempt has been made to force the hand of the Government, and to compel them to undertake a Bill upon this subject. Such a proceeding ought, in my opinion, to be resisted. I am happy to think that the acceptance of the Resolution will in Ireland afford an opportunity to Orangemen of meeting in rural schoolrooms to express their opinions upon the subjects of the day. The sharp practice of the hon. Member for the Eccles Division—

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. Member should use such a phrase. Such an expression cannot be permitted.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to withdraw the words I have used, Mr. Speaker. But still, I do think that the hon. Member was trying to steal a march

on us, and, under all the circumstances, I feel compelled to move the adjournment of the Debate.

The Question was not put.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to move that the Question be now put.

MR. PHILIPPS: I move that the question be put.

MR. SPEAKER: The original Question was that I do now leave the Chair.

(10.26.) MR. WILLIAM LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): Having voted in favour of this Motion on former occasions, I am glad the Government have accepted the Resolution that has been placed before the House. I, therefore, see nothing worth while fighting about. As the manager of a country school, I have to say that I have found no difficulty in allowing opposing Parties to use the school and air their opinions as they think proper. The result of the arrangement has been most beneficial to the village and to the district with which I am connected. It seems to me to be unreasonable to force the Government upon short notice to add the important measures already in their programme by including a Bill embodying the Resolution now before the House. Why could not the hon. Member bring in a Bill himself? Nobody will block its passage, and I hope that the hon. Member will bring forward the matter. I, for one, shall be heartily glad to support him.

(10.28.) SIR E. BIRKBECK (Norfolk, N.): I have to thank the Government, on behalf of the Eastern Counties, for what they have done in regard to the Resolution of the hon. Member. But is it to be understood that the Government, in adopting it, are to introduce a Bill embodying it, and so to set aside the Small Holdings Bill and other measures that they have undertaken?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: As the hon. Member has raised the question, I can save some time by saying that the Government were obliged to an Educational Rating Bill of their own, and I should like to know whether the First Lord will insert a clause giving practical effect to this resolution? No other business would

thus be set aside; on the contrary, the Government would be making this Resolution and its fulfilment part of their own business.

SIR E. BIRKBECK: The right hon. Gentleman is entirely mistaken if he imagines that I and my hon. Friends are going to allow a Bill like the Small Holdings Bill to be put aside in favour of such a measure as this. We intend to stick firmly to our guns upon this subject. I ask hon. Members opposite to quote some precedent in support of the action which the supporters of the Resolution have taken.

(10.29.) MR. SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich): I have to express my appreciation of the manner in which the Government has dealt with the Resolution. I have some knowledge of country life and of electioneering, and I have always found it to be a great grievance that the use of schools was allowed to one Party and not to another. It is most desirable that some change should be introduced, and I am, therefore, particularly glad to hear the views of the Vice President of the Council. Since legislation was necessary I should like to see it given effect to without delay. I am, however, not surprised that the Government should hesitate to undertake the responsibility of bringing in another Bill. I had hoped that the hon. Member would have brought in a Bill himself, but as an Educational Rating Bill is about to be brought in by the Government, I wish to know whether it is not possible for the Government to bring in a clause giving effect to this Resolution?

(10.30.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A number of appeals have been made to Her Majesty's Government from several quarters of the House, and this circumstance will, perhaps, serve as my excuse for asking permission for again interfering in the discussion. Unfortunately the speech which I delivered an hour-and-a-half ago was heard by a comparatively thin House, and I think few hon. Members now present are really aware of the original cause of the present dispute. I expressed my hope on the part of the Government that the Resolution and the Debate which had taken place might have an effect upon every

manager of a school throughout the United Kingdom, and induce him to allow the school to be used for every legitimate purpose. And I pointed out that when the Bill, that I thought was going to be introduced by the hon. Gentleman opposite, was brought forward we should have to deal with a considerable number of difficulties which I then enumerated—difficulties partly depending upon such subjects as the necessity for forbidding secularist meetings in schools, partly depending upon the necessity for dealing with the danger of damage to the schools by those who used them for public meetings or other gatherings, and partly depending upon the difficulty in Ireland of dealing with schools under the National Board, which receive larger contributions than schools in England, and partly depending upon the difficulty of dealing with schools under the management of the nuns in Ireland. And I pointed out in the most friendly spirit the difficulties that the hon. Gentleman would have to encounter in introducing his Bill. These remarks of mine gave rise to a discussion, and in the course of this discussion hon. Gentlemen opposite appear to be under the impression—honestly and fairly formed, I am sure—that my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council had made a promise to bring in a Bill. My right hon. Friend is not conscious of having made any such promise at all. However, I now understand for the first time that it is supposed that it is the Government that are going to bring in the Bill, and that it is not the hon. Gentleman opposite who is going to have the well-deserved credit of drafting the measure. Now, I wish simply to say that the only objection which the Government have to deal with the extraordinary difficulties of this question is the difficulty of time. We are now engaged—if I may venture to enumerate them to the House without breach of Order—we are now engaged upon a very critical Irish Education Bill, a Bill for Distributing the Grant in Scotland, a Small Holdings Bill, an Irish Local Government Bill, and upon a Bill for regulating the procedure of Private Bill Legislation, and some other measures of really first-rate importance

—and all I have mentioned are in addition to Supply. Now, everybody knows that the Government have nominally command of a certain portion of the time of the House. But, as a matter of fact, no Government that ever existed has been able to carry more than a certain percentage even of the important measures introduced in any Session. It appears to me, therefore, with all respect to the hon. Gentleman, that probably there might be a better chance for his Resolution being embodied in an operative Bill if it were brought in by a private Member than if it were brought in by the Government at the end of a list of measures, none of which could be dropped for the purpose of bringing in a Bill dealing with this question, and this question alone. Everybody will admit that. Now, I understand that a proposal has come, not from an hon. Friend of my own behind me, but from an hon. Gentleman opposite—a right hon. Gentleman opposite—that we should graft upon the Education Rating Bill some provisions dealing with this question. Now, I certainly have gathered, from a faint but significant indication coming from the hon. Gentleman, that the Education Rating Bill was a Bill that was going to be violently opposed. Well, it seems—what shall I say?—most grotesque for the Government to appeal to a Bill hon. Gentlemen opposite objected to, a measure which they desire to accept; because it would compel them, in order to get what they wanted, to swallow what they did not want. Now, I distinctly and authoritatively understand from what has fallen from hon. Gentlemen opposite that they are prepared to accept the Rating of Schools Bill if we are able to add to it a measure dealing with this particular question. Now that I understand that, I will endeavour, with my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council, conjointly to frame a Bill which shall carry into effect these two objects; which I understand now to be desired equally by both sides of the House, namely, the relief, to a certain extent, of voluntary schools from rating and the opening of voluntary schools

all legitimate public meetings and all the legitimate purposes contemplated by the hon. Gentlemen opposite. That understanding I am perfectly satisfied for the purpose of finishing the evening with great harmony, to endeavour to frame a Bill which shall, on these lines, meet the desires of everybody in the House.

(10.35.) SIR W. HARCOURT: With the same desire as the right hon. Gentleman, I ask the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes to just refer to an extremely ingenious proposal. Without desiring to introduce any controversial matter at all, I shall only say at this unfortunate cloud which has arisen in the serene sky was mainly due to the interference of Jupiter himself, because so long as a lesser light led the night, and the Vice President

the Council had addressed the House, we were all agreed, and we were perfectly satisfied with the course the Government had taken. It was not until the First Lord of the Treasury made a speech of a highly sceptical character with reference to the Bill, pointing out the difficulties and almost the impossibility, with a certain gusto on his part, with which my hon. Friend who moved the Resolution would be met, that we began—

I may use a vulgar phrase—to smell the rat, and understand exactly the game the Government were playing. They thought they could accept the Resolution and then leave my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden in a position in which they knew very well nothing would come from it. Nobody knows this House can suppose seriously that my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden, would give the smallest chance of passing a private Bill on that subject. Well, then the first time after the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury we saw that the Government meant to have as little to do with it as possible; and that is the reason my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden desires to have an expression of opinion on the part of the House that the Government ought to take it in hand. Well, the Government have declared their desire to carry this Resolution, and, therefore, we are assured that they have no objection in principle in carrying it out. The

only question with them is the question of time. Very well, so far we are all agreed. Then, coming to the Education Rating Bill of the Government, if the First Lord of the Treasury thinks we are going to enter into a bargain with reference to the remaining clauses of the Bill, he is entirely mistaken—if he thinks we are going to be gambled out of it, and that he will remove all objections with regard to the other clauses of the Bill by introducing a clause with which both sides of the House agree. He has no right to ask from us as a consideration for introducing a clause with which he agrees that we shall support a clause to which we are opposed. If it were true that one side was agreed upon one and opposed to the other and *vice versa*, there might be some sense in that; but where it is a clause with which both sides of the House agree, it is only reasonable to ask the Government, having possession of the time of the House, that it should introduce into the Bill a clause with which we are assured both sides of the House will concur. Now, upon that basis we can perfectly agree. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman was only indulging in a pleasant irony when he attempted to impose upon us the condition of not opposing the other clauses of his Bill if he should introduce this clause into his Bill. If we can understand now that he will introduce a clause into it that should express the general feeling of the House on the subject, I think the House would be satisfied.

\*(10.42.) VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen): I beg to propose the Amendment placed on the Paper by the hon. Member for Wigan, that the words in "rural districts" be inserted after the word "that" in line 5. As the Resolution now stands it begins by reciting that there is a want of room in rural districts. That would seem to imply that any alteration in the law which is proposed would apply to rural districts and rural districts only, but that is not so, as it appears in the Resolution as it stands. I am sure the hon. Member for Saffron Walden would agree that it is not so if his attention were called to it. I object, for my own part, to the



manager of a school throughout the United Kingdom, and induce him to allow the school to be used for every legitimate purpose. And I pointed out that when the Bill, that I thought was going to be introduced by the hon. Gentleman opposite, was brought forward we should have to deal with a considerable number of difficulties which I then enumerated—difficulties partly depending upon such subjects as the necessity for forbidding secularist meetings in schools, partly depending upon the necessity for dealing with the danger of damage to the schools by those who used them for public meetings or other gatherings, and partly depending upon the difficulty in Ireland of dealing with schools under the National Board, which receive larger contributions than schools in England, and partly depending upon the difficulty of dealing with schools under the management of the nuns in Ireland. And I pointed out in the most friendly spirit the difficulties that the hon. Gentleman would have to encounter in introducing his Bill. These remarks of mine gave rise to a discussion, and in the course of this discussion hon. Gentlemen opposite appear to be under the impression—honestly and fairly formed, I am sure—that my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council had made a promise to bring in a Bill. My right hon. Friend is not conscious of having made any such promise at all. However, I now understand for the first time that it is supposed that it is the Government that are going to bring in the Bill, and that it is not the hon. Gentleman opposite who is going to have the well-deserved credit of drafting the measure. Now, I wish simply to say that the only objection which the Government have to deal with the extraordinary difficulties of this question is the difficulty of time. We are now engaged—if I may venture to enumerate them to the House without breach of Order—we are now engaged upon a very critical Irish Education Bill, a Bill for Distributing the Grant in Scotland, a Small Holdings Bill, an Irish Local Government Bill, and upon a Bill for regulating the procedure of Private Bill Legislation, and some other measures of really first-rate importance

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

—and all I have mentioned are in addition to Supply. Now, everybody knows that the Government have nominally command of a certain portion of the time of the House. But, as a matter of fact, no Government that ever existed has been able to carry more than a certain percentage even of the important measures introduced in any Session. It appears to me, therefore, with all respect to the hon. Gentleman, that probably there might be a better chance for his Resolution being embodied in an operative Bill if it were brought in by a private Member than if it were brought in by the Government at the end of a list of measures, none of which could be dropped for the purpose of bringing in a Bill dealing with this question, and this question alone. Everybody will admit that. Now, I understand that a proposal has come, not from an hon. Friend of my own behind me, but from an hon. Gentleman opposite—a right hon. Gentleman opposite—that we should graft upon the Education Rating Bill some provisions dealing with this question. Now, I certainly have gathered, from a faint but significant indication coming from the hon. Gentleman, that the Education Rating Bill was a Bill that was going to be violently opposed. Well, it seems—what shall I say?—most grotesque for the Government to append to a Bill hon. Gentlemen opposite objected to, a measure which they desire to accept; because it would compel them, in order to get what they wanted, to swallow what they did not want. Now, I distinctly and authoritatively understand from what has fallen from hon. Gentlemen opposite that they are prepared to accept the Rating of Schools Bill if we are able to add to it a measure dealing with this particular question. Now that I understand that, I will endeavour, with my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council, conjointly to frame a Bill which shall carry into effect these two objects; which I understand now to be desired equally by both sides of the House, namely, the relief, to a certain extent, of voluntary schools from rating, and the opening of voluntary schools

for all legitimate public meetings and for all the legitimate purposes contemplated by the hon. Gentlemen opposite. On that understanding I am perfectly satisfied for the purpose of finishing the evening with great harmony, to endeavour to frame a Bill which shall, on these lines, meet the desires of everybody in the House.

(10.35.) **SIR W. HARCOURT**: With the same desire as the right hon. Gentleman, I ask the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes to just refer to his extremely ingenious proposal. Without desiring to introduce any controversial matter at all, I shall only say that this unfortunate cloud which has arisen in the serene sky was mainly due to the interference of Jupiter himself, because so long as a lesser light ruled the night, and the Vice President of the Council had addressed the House, we were all agreed, and we were perfectly satisfied with the course the Government had taken. It was not until the First Lord of the Treasury made a speech of a highly sceptical character with reference to the Bill, pointing out the difficulties and almost the impossibility, with a certain gusto on his part, with which my hon. Friend who moved the Resolution would be met, that we began—if I may use a vulgar phrase—to smell a rat, and understand exactly the game the Government were playing. They thought they could accept the Resolution and then leave my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden in a position in which they knew very well nothing would come from it. Nobody who knows this House can suppose seriously that my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden, would have the smallest chance of passing a Private Bill on that subject. Well, then for the first time after the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury we saw that the Government meant to have as little to do with it as possible; and that is the reason my hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden desires to have an expression of opinion on the part of the House that the Government ought to take it in hand. Well, the Government have declared their desire to carry out this Resolution, and, therefore, we are assured that they have no objection on principle in carrying it out. The

only question with them is the question of time. Very well, so far we are all agreed. Then, coming to the Education Rating Bill of the Government, if the First Lord of the Treasury thinks we are going to enter into a bargain with reference to the remaining clauses of the Bill, he is entirely mistaken—if he thinks we are going to be gambled out of it, and that he will remove all objections with regard to the other clauses of the Bill by introducing a clause with which both sides of the House agree. He has no right to ask from us as a consideration for introducing a clause with which he agrees that we shall support a clause to which we are opposed. If it were true that one side was agreed upon one and opposed to the other and *vice versa*, there might be some sense in that; but where it is a clause with which both sides of the House agree, it is only reasonable to ask the Government, having possession of the time of the House, that it should introduce into the Bill a clause with which we are assured both sides of the House will concur. Now, upon that basis we can perfectly agree. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman was only indulging in a pleasant irony when he attempted to impose upon us the condition of not opposing the other clauses of his Bill if he should introduce this clause into his Bill. If we can understand now that he will introduce a clause into it that should express the general feeling of the House on the subject, I think the House would be satisfied.

\*(10.42.) **VISCOUNT CRANBORNE** (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen): I beg to propose the Amendment placed on the Paper by the hon. Member for Wigan, that the words in "rural districts" be inserted after the word "that" in line 5. As the Resolution now stands it begins by reciting that there is a want of room in rural districts. That would seem to imply that any alteration in the law which is proposed would apply to rural districts and rural districts only, but that is not so, as it appears in the Resolution as it stands. I am sure the hon. Member for Saffron Walden would agree that it is not so if his attention were called to it. I object, for my own part, to the

schools being thrown open universally, and for this very good reason, that the grievance only exists in the rural districts. For my own part, I know that in the last Election of 1886 I had the obligation thrown upon me to address several meetings in the open air, but it was balmy summer weather. In the winter, of course, it would be different. It is not often, however, in rural districts, that you have a numerous audience to listen to you. In these country districts perhaps a couple of hundred people gather round the chair where the speaker stands, and he has no difficulty in making his voice heard. The grievance does not, therefore, exist in the rural districts in the summer time, but in the winter time no doubt a difficulty does arise. In the towns a totally different state of circumstances at once appears, but there is no difficulty whatever in finding room. (Cries of "Oh!" and "Yes!") I submit there is very little difficulty at all. I venture to say that in the town of Darwen, which is the principal town in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, no person would have a difficulty in finding room to address the electors. But, supposing there is a difficulty, I do not think there is any claim on the voluntary schools of the district; because there is a collection of rich ratepayers who have plenty of money to erect a suitable building if they want it. The difficulty, therefore, applies to rural districts, and to rural districts only, and, therefore, the words should be inserted in the Resolution.

MR. GARDNER: I believe this is an Amendment which we cannot accept. It is perfectly true that the words "in rural districts" as put in the Preamble of my Resolution might convey to the House that it was only intended that the Resolution should apply to rural districts. So far as I am concerned it was my intention that the operation of this Resolution should be confined to the rural districts in which, to my knowledge, there is a very pressing need; but when the Resolution has been accepted by the Government in a wider sense, and when they have decided that it should extend to the urban districts, I think it is a little

hard of the noble Lord to move an Amendment which restricts it to the rural districts. For my part, I cannot accept the Amendment; and after the way in which the Resolution was accepted by them I cannot believe that Her Majesty's Government will accept the Amendment, as it would absolutely conflict with the intention they had in accepting the Resolution.

\*(10.55.) MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): I agree with what has fallen from my hon. Friend who has just sat down. It is on principle we claim this right; and that principle extends to the urban districts quite as much as to the rural districts. There can be no distinction. No doubt in towns there are larger opportunities for finding other places for meetings than in the country. But it is the principle we insist upon; and that principle, as I understand it, has been practically accepted by the Government. I was obliged to use the words "as I understand it," because it so happens that I was not present during the entire Debate; and how was I employed? I was employed in possibly the less important business of addressing a public meeting in a country, district not far from London, as may be inferred by my presence here; and the meeting was held in a large room belonging to a Board school, where we had one of the most comfortable and orderly and convenient meetings that I have ever attended; and I could not help thinking, when I enjoyed that opportunity of saying the best I could for Her Majesty's Government, what a comment my experience was upon the Motion of my hon. Friend behind me, because, if this had not been a Board school—if there had not been a School Board in this locality—perhaps we should have been compelled to hold our meeting in some fusty old room, where we should have suffered the greatest discomfort. I hope the Government will stand by the arrangement they have come to, and that they will not accept the modification the noble Lord has proposed.

(10.64.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the agreeable way in which he has spent the even-

ing in addressing a meeting, and upon the admirable accommodation provided for him elsewhere; but I wish he had been here at an earlier part of the Debate, because he would have learned that the real reason of our discussing this question so much longer than anyone expected was this: we were all agreed as to this proposal in substance, but that it was rather difficult to carry it out in detail. That is really what occurred. My noble Friend behind me has moved an Amendment. No doubt he based his argument, and I think rightly, on the fact that there was more necessity for room in rural districts than in urban districts. At the same time, I am quite prepared to admit that there is a want of suitable accommodation in some urban districts, as has been pointed out by one hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for St. Pancras, who has told us that in his division there really was not suitable accommodation. Therefore, I am decidedly of opinion that, while it is true that it is in rural districts chiefly that there is a necessity, that necessity is not confined to rural districts; and that we cannot introduce into this Resolution an Amendment confining it to the rural districts. That only illustrates the extraordinary difficulty of dealing with this question. I conceive, however, that if you give an unrestricted right to use the schools in urban districts, you will give the right not only to the politician, but to everyone who wishes to make profit, or trade, or anything else by discussion at a meeting to go to a schoolroom and hold it there, as the cheapest place of the kind to be had. The West End Socialists, and other gentlemen of very extravagant views which are commonly held, there can be no doubt, in the urban districts, will claim the use of the cheapest rooms. In urban districts no doubt the cheapest available rooms would be the schools, if they were placed by Parliament at the disposal of the people for nothing beyond the cost of the expense incurred, but that is probably a thing to which Parliament will not assent without limitation. It would be very difficult for the House to lay down as an absolute principle, to which no exception is to be made, that public schools sub-

vented by the State, should be handed over to any persons who desired to hold a meeting, in face of the fact that their principle would apply to the convent schools in Ireland, which receive the largest subventions from the State. That being so, I would advise the right hon. Gentleman not to place his principle too highly. But, Sir, the object with which I rose was to recommend my noble Friend behind me (Viscount Cranborne) and others, who have put down Amendments, to withdraw them, on the distinct understanding that this Resolution is to be allowed to pass without any Amendment, because I believe that it is impossible within the scope of a Resolution to introduce all the safeguards which will be found absolutely necessary when the unfortunate draftsman begins to deal with the complicated problems which will have to be faced and dealt with before the principle of this Resolution can be embodied in an Act of Parliament. In the meanwhile, Sir, whilst it is distinctly understood that we accept this Resolution without addition or amendment, I would strongly recommend my Friends not to press their Amendments on the present occasion.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, we ought most distinctly to understand what the precise position of the Government is in reference to this matter. They will not undertake to do what their own supporters have asked them to do, and what the Member for Norwich (Mr. S. Hoare), particularly pressed them to do, namely, deal with this in the Education (Rating) Bill. If that were done there would be no necessity for the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Eccles (Mr. Roby) being pressed. But the unfortunate thing is that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury in speech after speech has one sentence in favour of the Resolution and a dozen sentences against it, and it is that fact which accounts for all our difficulties. The right hon. Gentleman has insisted upon the enormous difficulties and has enlarged upon every point, and the almost impossibility of it, and a Resolution accepted in that spirit will certainly never be effective. If the Resolution had been accepted in the

spirit manifested by the Vice President of the Council, it would have been a different thing. But while professing frankly to accept the Resolution, the Leader of the House has adopted a disparaging tone and raised every conceivable phantom against carrying it out. Everything he has said to-night is against the Resolution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, not against the Resolution.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, at any rate, against the possibility of its being carried out. Sir, a man who does not believe in the possibility of a thing never carries it out. The only object of the addition moved by the Member for Eccles is to have some distinct understanding from the Government that they really mean to do what they can to ensure that this Resolution is carried out. The right hon. Gentleman has not told us whether the Government mean to insert clauses in the Education Rating Bill, and on that point we are entitled to assurances, because upon that we may come to terms. Why have we not had those assurances? Because everybody knows that the object of the Government is to delay, and ultimately to defeat, this Resolution. That will be thoroughly understood inside of this House and out of it. On our part we frankly understand the meaning and object of these manœuvres. But, Sir, even now if the Government will come frankly forward and say, "We will accept this Resolution, and will do our best to carry it out," this Debate ought to come, and would come, to an end.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Sir, I do not think that the tone of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman is altogether calculated to bring this discussion to a speedy or an amicable close. The right hon. Gentleman imputed to my hon. Friends beside and behind me a desire to delay and defeat this Resolution by moving Amendments. But, Sir, all these Amendments were on the Paper, whereas the friends of the right hon. Gentleman have got up at the last moment and moved Amendments which are not on the Paper.

MR. ROBY: I have not moved an Amendment; I have only given notice that I would move.

*Sir William Harcourt*

MR. RITCHIE: Well, I will substitute the words "proposes to move" for the word "move"; and I will say that the hon. Gentleman proposes to move a Resolution which is not on the Paper, and as to which we had not the smallest notion a couple of hours ago. And yet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby brings against my hon. Friends behind me a charge of obstruction, although he has not addressed one single word of remonstrance to his hon. Friend behind him for moving an Amendment that is not on the Paper.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Amendment of my hon. Friend arose out of the speech of the Leader of the House. He could not have given notice of it.

MR. RITCHIE: There was nothing in the Resolution which imposed on any one the duty of carrying it out, and, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman the moment the Government accepted the Resolution, which is as much as is ever done in such cases, put up one of his supporters to move a new and most important Amendment, and that at the eleventh hour. What is the right hon. Gentleman's warrant for so unprecedented a proceeding? It is because my right hon. Friend, in accepting the Resolution, alluded to the many points of difficulty that would attend its enforcement. Would the right hon. Gentleman have wished that my right hon. Friend should have deceived the House by saying the matter was easy to deal with? It never was in the mind of my right hon. Friend not to do everything that could possibly be done to give effect to the Resolution. There was every intention on the part of the Government to give effect to it. There is another point. The Leader of the House, in answer to the appeals made to him from both sides, expressed the willingness of the Government to give effect to those appeals, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, though criticising the terms, expressed entire satisfaction with the conclusion, and everybody thought that there the matter would end.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Let us understand that. There was a con-

dition annexed. Is that condition withdrawn? If so I am satisfied.

MR. RITCHIE: My right hon. Friend did not impose any condition at all. What he said was that originally there was a strong expression of opinion from the other side against the exemption from rating of elementary schools; that it was likely the Government Bill would lead to a great deal of discussion, and meet with much objection from the other side. He said—"If you appeal to us to give effect to the Resolution by inserting a clause in our Bill, you must expect that that Bill is going to be carried." That is all he said. He imposed no condition at all. He said that the Government had taken note of the suggestions that had been made; that they would endeavour to give effect to the proposals suggested, and would consider in what way the wishes of the House could be met; and that they would see whether it was possible to frame any clauses which could be inserted in the Bill dealing with the rating of schools. That is what I say now; that is what I fully understood was accepted by the Member for Derby, and accepted on the understanding that there would be no Amendments.

MR. ROBY: If I understand the right hon. Gentleman aright, the Government will endeavour to give effect to the Resolution by legislation during the present Session.

MR. RITCHIE: What I said was that the Government would endeavour to give effect to the suggestions made by Members on both sides of the House, and would frame some clauses which might be taken in conjunction with the Bill which they propose to introduce relating to the rating of elementary schools.

MR. ROBY: As I understand that what I desire will be done by means of a clause to be introduced in a Bill promoted by the Government, I am perfectly willing not to move my Amendment.

MR. J. G. TALBOT (Oxford University): I ventured earlier in the evening to suggest to my hon. Friend beside me what I wish now publicly to express, that it would be well if his Amendments were not pressed. In view of what the Government has said as to

the clauses which they will introduce in their Rating Bill, I hope the Amendment will not be pressed.

MR. JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I am somewhat surprised at the turn this Debate has taken. I had the honour of hearing the very admirable speech of the Vice President of the Council, and I left the House on the understanding that this Resolution had been accepted in its entirety by the Government. So far as I now understand, the sympathy of the Government is with the noble Lord behind them who has moved an Amendment. There was no restriction or qualification whatever attaching to the acceptance of the Resolution by the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman thinks he is representing my views he is entirely mistaken. I said I thought the Resolution should apply to all schools with proper safeguards.

MR. JOICEY: The Government are now attempting to attach a condition (Cries of "No, no!") Well, if I am in error I must admit it is owing to my not having heard the discussion.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: In deference to the wishes of the Leader of the House, I ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment to Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. F. S. POWELL (Wigan): I shall not proceed with my Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, taking into consideration the scarcity of buildings suitable for holding public meetings in rural districts, and the desirability that the electors of the country should be enabled to hear both sides of questions affecting Imperial and local interests, this House is of opinion that the school rooms in schools in receipt of Parliamentary Grants, on such occasions as do not interfere with the educational purposes of the schools, and under the condition of payment of all reasonable expenses by the conveners of the meeting, should be at the disposal of the inhabitants of the district in which the school is situated for the purpose of holding public meetings.

Supply,—Committee upon Monday next.

# EDUCATION AND LOCAL TAXATION RELIEF (SCOTLAND).

## LEAVE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [25th February],

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to make provision in regard to the Distribution and Application of sums from time to time paid to the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account, and in regard to the fee grant in Scotland."

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not always the practice of the Government on Fridays to set up Supply a second time?

MR. SPEAKER: That entirely depends upon the Government and the time of night.

MR. T. M. HEALY: There are Government Bills of great importance on the Paper; it is now 11.20 p.m.; and as it is certainly an unusual course for Her Majesty's Ministers not to set up Supply again, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no desire to stand in the way of the discussion of the other Resolutions on the Paper. But what I proposed to do was to proceed with the Private Bill Procedure Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Very well; I am satisfied.

Order read, and discharged.

## MOTION.

### PRIVATE BILL PROCEDURE BILL.

#### MOTION FOR LEAVE.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.), in rising to present a Bill to amend the Procedure with respect to Private Bills in Scotland and Ireland, said: Sir, I will endeavour, in deference to a request made to me by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs, to introduce in a very brief statement the proposals which Her Majesty's Government desire to make with regard to the reform of Private Bill Procedure in respect of Scotland and in respect of Ireland. This matter has to be looked at from two entirely different points of view. We have to look at it purely as

it relates to suitors in those parts of the United Kingdom, and we have to look at it as a relief to the Members of this House who have to carry on a great deal of heavy and laborious work in connection with Private Bill legislation. Now, Sir, as regards the first point, I do not think it necessary to say much. There is a very generally expressed desire in Scotland—a genuine but not so generally expressed desire in Ireland—that the Private Bill legislation of these two countries should, at all events so far as a good many of these proceedings necessary to coming to a decision upon cases are concerned, be conducted not at Westminster and not before Committees of these Houses, but in Ireland or Scotland, before some other form of tribunal. That much will be admitted by the Scotch and the Irish Members, and I do not propose to waste time in discussing that point. There is, however, another point of view which is, in my mind, at least as important, and that is what I may describe as the national aspect of this problem. The labour thrown upon Members of this House by Private Bill Committees is such, with the greatly increased time required by our Debates, and the greatly increased interest shown by the public in those Debates, that it becomes a burden they are very little able to bear. Sir, very valuable and remarkable evidence was given by the right hon. Gentleman behind me, the Chairman of the Committee of Selection (Sir John Mowbray), with regard to the extreme difficulty of getting Members of this House to serve on Private Bill Committees, and upon the correlative fact that Committees of the House of Lords were preferred by suitors, not because the House of Lords is better, but because it has more leisure to attend to Committees, and is therefore able to give greater satisfaction to those who go before it. I think it is our bounden duty, as far as we can, to relieve Members of this House of the labour which is thus thrown upon them, and it is also our bounden duty to satisfy the feelings of suitors in Scotland and Ireland by diminishing the cost and relieving them of the necessity of coming in every case to Westminster to try and conduct the

litigation in which they are interested. The Bill, therefore, attempts to remedy two evils which have long been felt. But this difficulty has always met those who attempted a remedy—namely, that if you remove the Private Bill legislation relating to Scotland and Ireland to a local tribunal, you will have the same class of cases decided in Scotland and in Ireland upon principles quite different from those obtaining at Westminster. It should also be borne in mind that, whilst the House should be relieved of its semi-judicial labour, it should not be relieved of the responsibility of deciding the principles that should regulate and govern Private Bill legislation in every part of the United Kingdom. Several proposals have been made for mitigating the case of suitors and relieving the labours of this House. One proposal was that all these matters should be tried, not first before a Committee of this House and then before a Committee of Lords, but that they should be tried before a single Committee partly composed of Peers and partly of Commoners. This was proposed with the view of saving half the expense and half the time; but, as was pointed out by the Committee, there was this great difficulty, this objection to the proposal—that the relief would be far less than the proposers of the plan imagined. Another suggestion is that the system of Provisional Orders carried out by the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board might be largely extended; but we must recollect that a Provisional Order saves trouble only when no Parliamentary opposition is expected. The passing of a Provisional Order is commenced by a local inquiry conducted by an officer delegated by the Department, and if the opposing parties in the locality are satisfied, then the matter passes the House of Commons *sub silentio*, and the House is not involved in the trouble of examination by Committee or the labour of arriving at a decision. But if the Bill is opposed after the Provisional Order is introduced, practically all the labour incident to an ordinary Private Bill is repeated in the case of a Provisional Order, and therefore no time, labour, or expense is saved by this process. There remains, then, the plan of a Special

Commission in Ireland and in Scotland, if the Bill is intended to apply to either of those parts of the United Kingdom by which the labour of a Private Bill Committee may be delegated to another and a paid tribunal. But it will be observed that almost every scheme hitherto proposed for utilizing a Special Commission of this kind labours under the defect that it either removes the whole of the Private Bill legislation submitted to the Commission from the control of Parliament, or else it so surrounds and hampers the decisions of the Commission with Parliamentary safeguards that practically suitors are as much inconvenienced and Parliament has as much labour thrown upon it as if the Commission had never been asked to intervene in the matter at all. One plan I ought to allude to very briefly has been suggested, the delegation of Parliamentary control altogether to the Commission, a plan which received a certain amount of sanction last year, yet which, in spite of the high authority supporting it, I cannot bring myself to recommend to the House. That plan is to delegate to a certain number of Members of this House the duty of sitting in Scotland or Ireland to assist paid Commissioners in dealing with these questions. It seems to me that plan raises most serious Constitutional issues, and is open to very grave objection from other points of view. Are you going to pay these Members or not? If you are, you will introduce a new and, I think, a very unwholesome precedent, and if you are not, how can you expect Members to absent themselves from their homes, and certainly from their business, for long periods of time, to carry on difficult and exhaustive inquiries in localities with which they are not connected? Again, is it right, is it in accordance with Parliamentary usage, that when a man is sent here by his constituents to discuss and vote upon various questions, we should send him away to take part in other business wholly unconnected with the Debates in this House, business which obviously would prevent him from doing his fair share of the work going on at Westminster, and bearing his proper share of the responsibility which attaches to decisions come to in this House upon



questions submitted to it? For these reasons, as the House will readily conceive, on the whole, I do not think the Government ought to take on themselves the responsibility of proposing such a very novel and, as we think, such a very inexpedient measure. Well, the plan we propose, which I venture to propose with great diffidence to the House, for I am well aware of the difficulties which surround this question, turns and centres on the appointment of what I may call a Joint Standing Committee of both Houses of Parliament. This Joint Standing Committee is to consist of the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords, and two Members appointed by each House in addition. The Committee, I may say, will have the right to sit for the purposes of this Bill, for which alone it is called into existence, even though the House may be prorogued—it may sit to carry on its business, if it so desire, at any time of the year. The first duty of this Joint Committee is to see that the promoters of any Bill *prima facie* relating to Scotland or Ireland have satisfied the Standing Orders of the House, or that the Standing Orders are suspended in reference to the measure they have introduced. The second point the Committee is to determine is whether the Bill is in the main a Scotch or an Irish Bill, or whether it is not. It will be observed that unless you give a decision on this question to a tribunal having what I may describe as an equitable jurisdiction you will be face to face with many difficulties. You may have a scheme which is in the main Scotch or Irish, but which overflows, as I may say, however little, into England and Wales, and affects those parts of the United Kingdom. If you lay down a hard-and-fast line on the subject, you will preclude such a Bill from reference to the Commission whose duties I will explain presently. I propose to give this Joint Committee a discretion in the matter, allowing it to decide without appeal whether in its opinion the measure is one mainly Scotch or Irish as the case may be. The third point this Joint Committee will have to determine is whether the Bill involves

any principle upon which Parliament has not hitherto come to any decision. Notice that most of the Bills that come before us are of a kind upon which Parliament has over and over again expressed a general view and has frequently laid down the general lines upon which a Committee should decide. But now and then it happens—let us take the Channel Tunnel proposal, or electric lighting schemes; and there are others that might be cited—now and then it happens that some new invention or project comes to the front upon which Parliament has never settled what should be the principle of procedure to be adopted by a Private Bill Committee to which it delegates so much of its authority. If in the opinion of the Joint Committee the Bill is one that does involve a new principle, then, in that case, we propose that the present procedure should be maintained. It is only when a Bill belongs to a well-understood class, a class for which precedents and principles are laid down, that the Bill is to be relegated for decision to the Commission. I may notice that one advantage that will be gained by the institution of this Joint Committee is that it will have the assistance of that legal advice from experienced officials which now aids in the conduct of Private Bill legislation. I think nobody acquainted with the inner working of our legislative system will deny that this will be of great advantage to the system of Private Bill legislation for Scotland and Ireland. This, broadly speaking, is the principle of our Bill. The actual constitution of the Commission is a matter of less importance, and of less novelty. It will be sufficient to say that it appears to me we shall be very wrong if we do not utilise the existing Railway Commissioners, highly paid and competent officials, well acquainted with the work to be done, and who comprise among their number a Scotch Judge eminently qualified to assist in Scotch affairs, and an Irish Judge to assist in Irish affairs. But in addition to the Railway Commission thus constituted of Judges and Railway Commissioners there should be, I think, an Assistant Commissioner to deal with Scotch matters, and an Assistant Commissioner to deal with

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

Irish matters. I believe that would be sufficient for all the work of the Commission, but there is power given in the Bill for the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament to appoint additional Commissioners should the Joint Committee represent to them that the number of Bills referred to the Commission is in excess of what the Commissioners are able to deal with. It will be observed that if our plan is carried into effect, the stages of Bills will practically be: The stage before the Joint Committee—at which, of course, counsel will not appear—when the Committee will decide whether the Bill is within the Standing Orders, whether it involve any new principle, on which Parliament has not hitherto given any decision, and whether the Bill be mainly Scotch or Irish; the Bill will then be referred to the Commission; it will be read a first and second time in the two Houses without debate; it will be referred back by the Commission to the Joint Committee, who will be able to suggest formal Amendments to the Commission, the convenience of which all acquainted with Private Bill legislation will understand. The Bill will then come before the House for Third Reading, when it may be debated, may be rejected, or may be referred back to the Commission with instructions to carry out any Amendment which may be decided upon by the House. I hope, and I believe, that the Bill which I have thus briefly expounded to the House, though novel in some of its principles, really carries out many of the objects which have been aimed at by gentlemen who have previously endeavoured to frame schemes of this kind. I think it will retain the control of the Imperial Parliament, not only over the general principles of Private Bill legislation, but also over the details of any Bill on which Parliament desires to express its mind, and while carrying out these objects will enable local inquiries to be made in Scotland or in Ireland, as the case may be, and I think it will considerably diminish the cost of litigation. I believe it will satisfy the demand, the most legitimate demand, over and over again brought before this House by inhabitants of Scotland and Ireland, who have long protested against a system which drags them up

to Westminster to deal with affairs which are, in the main, matters of detail, which can be better entered upon by inquiry on the spot.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Procedure with respect to Private Bills in Scotland and Ireland."—(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

\*(11.43.) MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): This is a question to which the salutary rule recently laid down by the Chairman of Ways and Means may well be applied—namely, that we should refrain from expressing a strong opinion upon a measure until we have actually seen it in print, for it is obvious that its provisions are of a somewhat complicated nature. But I may say at once of it that it seems to have been much better thought out and to be a better contrived measure than that introduced last year, and the fact of the scope of the measure having being so greatly changed justifies the opposition offered last year. At the same time, I confess that there will be considerable opposition to some parts of the measure, and upon like grounds. The right hon Gentleman bases his scheme to a considerable extent on the supposition that Members of this House are over-worked and need relief. I am quite aware of the strong evidence given on this subject by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University (Sir J. Mowbray), but I have heard other Members of the Committee of Selection decline to bear out that opinion, and for my part I do not believe that a case has been made out to show that Committees cannot be adequately manned for the purpose of dealing with Private Bills. There are many of us who maintain that Railway Bills and other Private Bills are, after all, Bills affecting public interests, and ought to be dealt with by those who are distinctly representative of, and responsible to, public opinion; and unless a clear case were made out of the absolute impossibility—and this is the hypothesis the right hon. Gentleman proceeds upon—of finding among Members of the House of Commons sufficient time and capacity to do this work; unless a reasonable case were made out, I should

be strongly opposed to handing over these inquiries in any degree to paid Commissioners or Judges, Railway Commissioners or others. We discussed these matters often last year, and it was often pointed out that the business which makes up the total of our Private Bill legislation consists broadly of two parts, and by far the largest part is that originated by Local Bodies, for the acquisition of gas works, water works, and so on—local legislation required by Municipal or other Local Authorities. I conceive that this part of the business could be largely dealt with by an improved system of Provisional Orders, and by increasing the powers of Local Authorities. But when we come to Bills promoted by great Railway Companies the position is somewhat different. They maintain there would be no saving of expense by local inquiry, and they are the best judges, for they pay the expense. At the same time, I quite recognise the fact that in Scotland there is a strong desire that inquiry should be local, and I am quite willing that it should be local, especially if litigants have no good reason to show why the case should be brought up here. But inquiry, local or not, ought, in the opinion of a good many of us, still to remain in the hands of the representatives of public opinion, and should not be placed in the hands of Judges or paid Commissioners. The right hon. Gentleman did not explain all the provisions of his Bill, and we shall be curious to know who these Assistant Commissioners are to be, and with whom is their nomination, whether they are to be paid—[Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes]—where they are to sit, and if an office is to be established. Last year considerable objection was taken to the Government proposal, because it involved the establishment of a new Board in Edinburgh, and I am curious to know if there is any proposal of the kind now. When we consider that the number of disputed Private Bills coming from Scotland average six or seven in the year—I think I am stating an extreme number—and that since last year the two principal belligerent Railway Companies in Scotland—the Caledonian and the North British—have come to an agreement that they will

not oppose each other, or encroach on each other's territory, I would ask, Where is the work of the Commissioners in Scotland to come from if their appointment is to be of a more or less permanent character? That is the great difficulty in the way of establishing any local tribunal, or fixed paid tribunal, for Scotland and Ireland alone. The right hon. Gentleman has not explained why the principle of his measure should not apply to England. If it is a good thing in itself I can conceive that the proper course would be, if you quite believe that you cannot get members to undertake the duty and discharge it efficiently, to have a highly paid and responsible tribunal to do the work for the three countries. You would then have work enough to do for the best class of men. But speaking without knowledge of the particulars of the scheme, and unable therefore to speak confidently, I confess I have no great hope of the results that will flow from establishing this half-and-half tribunal for the purpose of accomplishing the really small amount of work arising in Scotland and Ireland.

(11.50.) Mr. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I listened with attention to the First Lord of the Treasury, though I am not able to agree with him. It is his view, I suppose, that the Government must do something to remove grievances, so far as our country is concerned, but I am bound to say I listened to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman with a feeling of deep sadness. I want to know why he cannot let the thing alone if he cannot give us what we want? Why give that which does no good to anybody, and which nobody wants. So far as I am concerned, though I have no great love for the procedure in this House—if I was a promoter of a Bill I would rather come here ten times than go once before such an unfortunate tribunal as the right hon. Gentleman proposes to set up. I say nothing for Scotland except for the sake of symmetry. I do not know why this should apply to Scotland as well as Ireland, but I am not prepared to say whether it would be good for Scotland or not. As the Labourers

*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*

eland) Act originally appeared in 1883 it contained powers to take and compulsorily, and the decision was with the House, with considerable expense to petitioners. We got the Government with enormous difficulty, or it was thought almost an invasion of the sacred privileges of Parliament, to allow the Privy Council to do the business by Commission. A more unfit tribunal than the Irish Privy Council there could not be, all nominees of the party delighted to have the chance of knocking down any scheme a Board of Guardians may propose. Now, what is this proposal? First and foremost, what does it save? Nothing is saved. All the House fees have to be paid. Promoters have to come now with pockets loaded with gold for these fees. Then they have to run the gauntlet of the Standing Orders to the satisfaction of the Examiners. I hear praises given to the officials who have the conduct of Private Bill procedure, but I say a more inelastic set of gentlemen it would be difficult to find; they are bound by rules like the laws of the Medes and Persians, to the very letter of which they attach a sacred character. Plus these, the promoters will have to face a body like the Railway Commission, with Sub-Commissioners added by the Government of the day. There will be all the expenses of the First Reading; the Second and Committee stages are saved, and then the Bill goes through the House of Lords. Now, take the case of the Bill we had before us to-day dealing with the Belfast Lunatic Asylum. This would go before Judges and officials entirely out of sympathy with our point of view, and where our point of view would have no influence. But in the House we have a free arena for debate, and we can here prevent some mischief being done, though we may not be able to do much effective work. The right hon. Gentleman, with his usual cynicism, says he has brought forward this Bill to save the extremely heavy labours of Members of Committees. Now I have been in the House for twelve years, and I have never been asked to serve on a Private Bill Committee. I was present when the Chairman of the Committee of Selection gave evidence, in which he said promoters were all anxious to have

their Bills taken somewhere about Derby Day. Those who had evidence to give wished to be in town about that time, and so there was a glut of Committee business about that time. I cannot think that Members who do not take a very active part in our proceedings here would not be glad to discharge some function attaching to their position. Is not a Committee of this House a far better tribunal than the tribunal the right hon. Gentleman proposes? Members of this House are men of flesh and blood in touch with public opinion; but when you have a tribunal of officials, you have views and ideas entirely different from those you will find in the House. I say the right hon. Gentleman is trying to solve a problem insoluble except in one direction—namely, Home Rule—and in that alone. Unless you set up in Edinburgh and Dublin competent authorities racy of the soil to exercise their judgment upon these matters, men in whom the people have confidence, and whom they meet with in daily life, you will do no good. We want to deal with men of flesh and blood in whom we have confidence. These are the views we entertain, and we think the Bill unfortunate. It has no chance of passing; there is no demand for it. I am almost sure Scotland has no desire for it. The right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken expressed no desire for it; it suits nobody. The First Lord of the Treasury has had the opportunity of putting his proposal before the country before the date of the Dissolution, and I am glad he has had that opportunity. He has devoted himself to it in a painstaking manner, and nobody doubts his hard official work, though he has done the Irish people all the mischief he could during his tenure of office. Well, he has had the opportunity, and he has brought forward a Bill which satisfies nobody, not even himself. He does not think it so good as a Coercion Bill, but he thinks if it will do no good it will do no harm. But this will be worse than the present system, which is bad only in the sense that it is expensive and cumbrous; it is not bad in itself, and, therefore, I am opposed to this measure.

It being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### MILLBANK PRISON BILL—(No. 140.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

#### SUPPLY—REPORT.

#### CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1891-2 (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.)

Resolutions [25th February] reported.  
(See pages 1317-1328.)

#### CLASS I.

1. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £4,735, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for improving the Ventilation of the Houses of Parliament Buildings."

2. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for Expenditure in respect of Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain."

3. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Post Office and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain."

#### CLASS II.

4. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £498, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Lunacy in Scotland."

5. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,690, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

#### CLASS III.

6. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Costs of Criminal Prosecutions in England."

7. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Police Courts of London and Sheerness."

Resolutions agreed to.

#### LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ALLOTMENTS

##### BILL—(No. 94.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

#### MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND)

##### BILL—(No. 34.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

#### WORKHOUSE CONSUMPTION OF SPIRITS, &c.

Address for—

"Return showing the quantity of spirits, wine, and malt liquors consumed in each Workhouse in England and Wales in the year ending the 31st day of December, 1891, together with the expenditure in each Workhouse for each kind of intoxicating liquor for the same period, and stating the daily average number of in each Workhouse during the same term (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 206, of Session 1886);

And similar Return for Scotland and Ireland."—(Mr. Albert Bright.)

#### FEE GRANT (SCOTLAND).

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Fee Grant in Scotland, and of making provision with regard to the distribution and application of sums from time to time paid to the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account (Queen's Recommendation signified) upon Monday next.—(Sir John Gorst.)

House adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 29th February, 1892.*THE COLONIES AND THE McKINLEY  
TARIFF.

## QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

**THE EARL OF DERBY:** My Lords, I wish to take this opportunity of putting to the noble Lord, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, a question of which I have given him private notice. My noble Friend stated last week, in answer to a question that was put from this side of the House, that the West Indian Legislatures had been considering what new taxation should be levied in order to make up for the loss of Revenue resulting from the arrangement come to with the United States in consequence of the McKinley Tariff Act. My Lords, I have no doubt that the answer of my noble Friend was accurate as regards the West Indian Colonies generally; but, since that answer was given, I have received communications from certain persons connected with the Colony of Jamaica, who complain of the statement then made as not doing justice to the actual financial position of the Colony. They inform me that, although the total loss of the Revenue, consequent upon the new arrangements, exceeds £30,000 a year, it has not been found necessary, nor is it intended, to levy any new taxation in consequence. I understand that, since that answer, to which I refer, was given, some further information has been received at the Colonial Office, and I should be glad to know whether, in consequence of that information, my noble Friend is inclined in any way to modify or add to the statement he lately made.

**\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Lord KNUTSFORD):** My Lords, the statement which I made on the former occasion was made purposely in very general terms so as to comprehend all the Colonies; and, speaking broadly, the statement was correct; for the Colonial Legislatures have, speaking generally, been considering the question of what taxation, if any, would be necessary in order to make up for the loss occasioned by their action to meet the views of the United States. It is true that, as

regards Jamaica, the Governor, in his speech on the opening of the Legislative Council, stated, as his opinion, that it would not be necessary to raise any new taxation in Jamaica,—the Revenue being, as the noble Earl opposite has pointed out, in a very prosperous state,—and that, therefore, he did not propose to ask for fresh taxes. I have no official or other communication or intimation that this view has been adopted by the Legislative Council; but, at the same time, I have not the least doubt but that it will be. I may perhaps mention some other facts a little more in detail as regards the other Colonies, as this opportunity is now given me by the noble Earl. I may state that in British Guiana the Court is probably now considering Ways and Means. In Trinidad I have just approved of some votes imposing new taxation; but there are some proposed Stamp Acts which have not been settled by the Council so far as we know. In Barbadoes fresh Acts have been passed and have been sanctioned. In St. Vincent measures came before me after I had spoken on the former occasion, and I have now approved of those measures. In St. Lucia the questions are still under consideration; and so also in the Leeward Islands.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEES  
OF COUNTY COUNCILS.

## QUESTION—OBSERVATIONS.

**\*THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY:** My Lords, in venturing to put to Her Majesty's Government the question that stands in my name, I should like to ask, by the indulgence of the House, to be allowed to explain why it is that I do so. I do it in the interests of the County Councils themselves as much as of those who have asked for grants from them. My Lords, I recognise fully the difficulty in which these Councils have been placed, especially in the matter of technical education. They have perhaps been rather imperfectly instructed in their duties on this matter by the three Acts of Parliament passed in three recent years; they have had to formulate their principles and to work out their methods in practice as they went along; and, therefore, it was almost inevitable that there should be some little inequalities in their way of acting.

But, inasmuch as unfortunately,—I am afraid it is a matter of general knowledge,—elections to County Councils are conducted more or less on Party lines, it seems reasonable that the light of publicity should be brought to bear on their action, especially in the distribution of large sums of public money. I venture, my Lords, to ask whether it is not a matter of right, rather than of favour, that we should be explicitly informed on what principles and by what persons grants for technical education are either given or refused; and I beg, therefore, to ask Her Majesty's Government whether it is possible to require technical education Committees of the County Councils to publish minutes of their proceedings?

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK): My Lords, in the absence of my noble Friend (Lord Henniker) I have been requested to answer this question, which would naturally have fallen to him. My Lords, the fact is that there is no power to require a Committee of the County Council to publish minutes; nor am I aware that there is any authority for their incurring expenditure for such a purpose. It may be the case that they could admit reporters; but everybody will see that there might be a good deal of difficulty in admitting reporters to consultations of Committees. And, after all, my Lords, the grants are not made by the Committees, but by the Councils themselves.

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES

BILL [H.L.]—(No. 4.)

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read, and discharged.

SHORT TITLES BILL [H.L.]—(No. 12.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the object of this Bill is simply to shorten the language of Acts of Parliament. Your Lordships are aware that of late years it has been the practice in every Act of Parliament to introduce a short title which by Statute

*The Bishop of Salisbury*

is made the mode by which the Act can be cited; and that has been found in practice to be very convenient. But, unfortunately, that was not the practice in Parliamentary drafting until a comparatively short period since; the result of which is that all Acts of Parliament which have been passed before a particular date must now be cited by their long titles—and some of them are very long indeed. We popularly are in the habit of speaking of the *Habeas Corpus* Act, and the Statute of Fraud, and so forth, which is a convenient and popular mode of citing them; but, if you had to refer to either of those Acts in an Act of Parliament, you would require to have four or five, sometimes six, and, in one case that I have here, twelve lines as the title by which the particular Act is known. Under those circumstances, my Lords, it has been thought well to endeavour to grant to the references to former legislation the same procedure as the modern habit of Parliamentary drafting has introduced; and this Bill, which is called the Short Titles Bill, is simply for the purpose of re-christening the old Acts of Parliament with short titles, whereby they may be referred to in future when new legislation has to be applied to them. I am afraid your Lordships would not find much instruction or information by my reading through this Bill, or making any further observations upon it; because, after having explained its object, the only thing I could do would be to read the old titles of the old Acts of Parliament, and then to read the new titles that have been introduced for the purpose which I have indicated. I am afraid your Lordships would not consider that a profitable employment of your time, and therefore I will now simply move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>."  
—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to Order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House Tomorrow.

GAMING ACT, 1845, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Act of the 8th and 9th Vict., chap 109, intituled "An Act to amend the law concerning games and wages"—was presented by the Lord Herschell; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed. (No. 23.)

**PRESENTATION TO BENEFICES BILL [H.L.]**

A Bill to make better provision for the exercise of the right of presentation to benefices in cases where the right is now exercisable by parishioners or others forming a numerous class—was presented by the Lord Archbishop of York; read 1<sup>a</sup>; to be printed; and to be read 2<sup>a</sup> To-morrow. (No. 24.)

**BETTING AND LOANS (INFANTS) BILL [H.L.]—(No. 13.)**

**THIRD READING.**

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

Bill read 3<sup>a</sup> (according to Order.)

Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND REPEAL BILL [H.L.]**

A Bill for the repeal of the Local Government Acts of England and Scotland—Was presented by the Lord Denman; read 1<sup>a</sup>; to be printed; and to be read 2<sup>a</sup> To-morrow. (No. 25.)

**DURATION OF SPEECHES IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS BILL [H.L.] (No. 26.)**

A Bill to ascertain and limit the duration of speeches in the House of Lords. And

**WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL [H.L.] (No. 27.)**

A Bill for extending the right of voting at Parliamentary, Municipal, and County Council elections in the United Kingdom to duly qualified women—Were presented by the Lord Denman; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed.

**RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.**

Message from the Commons that they have come to the following Resolution, viz., that all Bills of the present Session to confirm Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the "Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1868," containing the classification of Merchandise Traffic, and the schedule of maximum rates and charges applicable thereto, be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, and to desire their Lordships' concurrence thereto; the said message to be taken into consideration To-morrow.

Standing Committee to meet To-morrow at Five o'clock.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock.

**HOUSE OF COMMONS,**

*Monday, 29th February, 1892.*

**PRIVATE BUSINESS.**

**LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Second Reading be deferred to Monday next."

(3.10.) MR. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.): I desire to protest against the postponement of this Bill until Monday. It was ordered for this day, and appears "by Order" on the Orders of the Day. A number of Members have attended early in their places expecting the Bill would be taken, and now it is again put off for a week. I do not know how these arrangements are made, but I do think that Members ought to have notice of a postponement of this kind, and should not be left to find it out at the very last moment when they expect the Bill to be taken. I have no objection whatever to the postponement, but I do not think it should be left on the Orders as to be taken "by Order."

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I believe it is still competent for an hon. Member to move the rejection.

Second Reading deferred to Monday.

**LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL.**

**SECOND READING.**

Order for Second Reading read.

(3.11.) MR. J. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I will briefly allude to its objects. It is for the purpose of continuing the tramway lines across Westminster Bridge and along the Embankment as far as the bridge of the South Eastern Railway, near Charing Cross Station, and the object is to connect the tramway systems on the south with the north side of the river. There has been, as I will shortly show, very considerable



demand for this tramway. Last year a Bill for constructing the line was promoted by the Tramway Company, but it was rejected in the House on the Second Reading stage. The Bill now, somewhat differing from the Bill then, is promoted by the London County Council itself. It appears to the Council that the circumstances of the case make it more properly the Authority to construct the line, inasmuch as the bridge and the Embankment are under its particular care by Act of Parliament. For this and for other reasons it has seemed desirable that the London County Council should construct the line. There are two portions of the line, the one I have described and a very small portion uniting the new line with the other London Tramway Companies lines, which come very near to the terminus of the South London Company, but as to this small portion of the line it is hardly worth while my speaking. The clauses of the Bill are in one respect very different from the ordinary clauses of a Tramway Bill. It is proposed that the Council shall have power to work the tramway itself if necessary, and I may say that that clause has been introduced into the Bill because if the tramway were to be constructed and the Tramway Company were not to lease it from the Council the line would be useless and the expenditure on construction wasted. It is not desired, however, by the London County Council to work the line, and an agreement between the Council and the South London Tramway Company has so far advanced that there is hope that an arrangement may be arrived at satisfactory to all parties for the working of the line by the Tramway Company, and if this agreement is arrived at then the clause for the making of the line by the London County Council will not be pressed. Negotiations for this agreement have advanced a considerable length; they have reached this stage: that whereas the London County Council ask £1,350 a year rental for the line from the South London Company, the Company is willing to give £1,000. That is the difference at issue, that and the question of rates, and these points surely may very fairly be settled by the Committee upstairs. If we are so near an agreement as that, it is hardly worth our while contemplating it falling through now. There was a clause in the Bill

*Mr. J. Stuart*

last year which caused great opposition, limiting the hours of servants to ten each day. There were many Members who cordially agreed with the proposal, but objection was taken to it being introduced in a clause in an Act of Parliament. In the present case, the County Council are willing to make this a clause in the agreement with the Company subject to the approval of the proper Authorities. No doubt one of the points at issue before the Committee will be whether such a clause should be introduced or not into the agreement between the Council and the South London Tramway Company. That is a suitable point for decision upstairs, it will take its place in the consideration of the agreement. The line is not proposed to be carried further than Charing Cross Bridge. The Lambeth Vestry, within whose district a considerable portion of the line lies, have signified their assent to the Bill. Now there come in one or two objections that have been raised to the Bill and have been circulated among Members in papers which have reached my hands, and one of these documents emanates I believe, though it does not bear the statement on the face of it, from the District Railway Company. This document argues that this Company paid £200,000 for the privilege of passing under the Embankment, that it has stations at Westminster Bridge and also at Charing Cross, and that to run a tramway line along the Embankment is not fair to them. Upon this I beg to observe that the right to go under the Embankment was the right purchased, there was never a thought of a monopoly being conferred of a line of communication there, and the same objection, if it hold good, would equally apply to streets in almost any quarter of London, and I cannot for a moment think that the House will throw out the Bill on this ground. Then the same document objects to the London County Council embarking on a speculative undertaking involving risk of loss, the burden of which must fall on the ratepayers. Now, I have told the House how far the arrangement for working the line has gone, and it will be in the power of the House to estimate how far this is likely to throw speculative burdens on the ratepayers. But this is in no sense an extraordinary or novel undertaking. Local Authorities have laid down a very large proportion

of the tramway lines in the country, and the London County Council are doing nothing speculative in this matter. Then there is a statement put forward that Westminster Bridge and the Embankment are thoroughfares peculiarly unsuitable for tramway lines. Now, Westminster Bridge is, as I am informed by engineers of the London County Council, one of the widest bridges crossing the Thames, and the Embankment is one of the widest drives in London, and if people are to travel by tramway this is just one of the lines to be taken. It is said it will destroy Victoria Embankment as a carriage drive; but this I cannot admit for a moment, seeing the width of the roadway, though, even if it did, let hon. Members observe the number of carriages driving along the Embankment for pleasure and compare the number with the crowds of working and middle class people passing by this route to and from the South of London. There is a very large number of people indeed, clerks, artisans, shop assistants, male and female, working men of all classes, composers, and others, who live in the South of London, and whose employment brings them to Westminster Bridge to cross to the other side of the river. They have to make the journey in all weathers, in rain or snow or mud, and unfortunately these conditions predominate in London, and these unfortunate people have to go to office, shop, or warehouse, in wet clothes and wet feet, to their considerable discomfort and with risk of injury to their health. If the tramway were constructed over Westminster Bridge, to say nothing of going any further, it would bring these people right up to lines of omnibuses, and of course going on to Charing Cross would do still more, and the crossing the bridge would land the people where they could avail themselves of Westminster Bridge Station of the District Railway. These facts have been before the London County Council in a memorial signed by no less than 62,000 inhabitants and resident ratepayers in the South of London, and these are some of the reasons I lay before the House in favour of this undertaking. I have only one more matter to touch upon, and that is that in one of these opposing memorials which have been circulated among Members of the House it is stated that, the present Council being just about to quit office,

it should not be allowed to commit its successor to this new departure. Well, the House has heard how very little of a new departure it is either in legislation or in the action of the London County Council itself, which has, as the House knows, resolved to take over a much more important piece of tramway than is now proposed to be made. But if the House throw out the Bill, if the Government should join with some of its supporters in the endeavour to throw out the Bill on the present occasion on the ground of objection I have just alluded to, then it will be a most extreme verification of what has been said on this side of the House—what has been predicted from this side of the House, not without full knowledge of the circumstances—that the deferring the County Council elections to March would have an exceedingly impeding effect on London legislation. If a Bill is not to pass because the Council is about to dissolve and its successor about to be elected, why then, for one whole year out of the three, will London progress and legislation for London and London people be absolutely arrested so far as the County Council is concerned. This question is of extreme importance to London people, and whatever points are at issue between the Council and the Company will be settled after the election by the chosen representatives of the people of London.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. J. Stuart.*)

\*(3.27.) SIR ALGERNON BORTHWICK (Kensington, S.): I was extremely sorry to hear the closing remarks of the hon. Gentleman, because I am certain that in my own opposition to the Bill I am not moved by any political motives, and I am positive that Her Majesty's Government had nothing on earth to do with any such motive in postponing the County Council elections. I am equally certain that in opposition to the Bill I shall find support from the other side of the House. I need not follow the hon. Gentleman into detail of the various clauses, because these may very properly be dealt with by the Committee should the Bill ever reach that stage, but I ask the House to throw out the Bill positively. In the first place, it comes before us in a very shifty, broken form, and in the very

statement we have just heard we find how inconclusive the arrangements are for the working of the Bill, and in the very statement put before us by the London County Council itself we read—

“The arrangement is so far complete that it will probably be ready for submission to the Council when it reassembles after the election if the Bill be read a second time.”

So we are to proceed on the hypothesis that if we pass the Bill, perhaps the London County Council may be able to entertain it after the new election. Then we ask if that is the case, seeing that the Bill was rejected only eight months ago, why are we troubled with the Bill again now; why not wait for the new Council to put it forward in a complete shape or a perfect form without taking any further steps? The hon. Gentleman has alluded to a certain amount of opposition from the Underground Railway Company, and that opposition appears to me perfectly natural. The Company paid £200,000 to the predecessors of the London County Council for the privilege of going under the Embankment, and, the Council having possessed themselves of this £200,000, now propose to run a line overground in opposition to the very persons from whom they derived this pecuniary benefit. But this is a matter which concerns the Railway Company, and is not the principal objection. The hon. Gentleman speaks of the Embankment as important as a means of traffic, and so it is of local traffic, but the hon. Gentleman will not tell me that the workmen, clerks, and others to whom he alludes have any business on the Embankment. They have no business, no work, no occupation there; they are not employed there. They travel long distances and they are dropped at various points. They do not all go to Lombard Street or to the City; they go to Regent Street and the City, and various places inside and outside the City, and, leaving the tramcars, are carried to their destination by the various lines of omnibuses which diverge in various directions in large numbers. I have counted six omnibuses in the minute passing my house, and excellent vehicles they are. I hope we shall have no comparison drawn to-day between these and “gilded chariots.” They are excellent conveyances, and the ladies of London avail themselves of the omnibus

*Sir Algernon Borthwick*

service quite as much as do the working classes. The stream of omnibuses crosses the bridge and takes natural directions according to the requirements of the traffic right or left and carrying passengers long distances for a penny. But none of these omnibuses take the line of the Embankment. No, they follow the natural routes, and I maintain that it is fiction to say that if you had this tramway it would be of the slightest real use. It is intended only to land passengers at the foot of a gentle hill rising to Charing Cross; it does not go to the station even, but practically nowhere—among a lot of cabs, where the terminus will cause an enormous amount of obstruction. It would cause the greatest amount of obstruction, too, on Westminster Bridge, where the roadway is only 53 feet wide. If you take 16 feet from the centre of the roadway you leave a very narrow margin for the traffic, which even now is often brought to a standstill. But the fact is, this proposal is the outcome of a long-standing endeavour on the part of Tramway Companies to capture the West End. For their own purposes they wish to have lines running through the West End of London. I am quite aware that the tramway system is of great public convenience in some parts of London, where the thoroughfares are suited to them, but as Lord Palmerston said, “Dirt is only matter in the wrong place,” so tramways become an intolerable nuisance when introduced into the unsuitable narrow thoroughfares of the West End. The traffic at many points is blocked beyond endurance now very often. We shall probably have to come to this House for powers to do something to relieve the congestion of traffic at Knightsbridge. Here and at such places as Hyde Park Corner, in spite of the admirable steering of the drivers of cabs and omnibuses, who with the utmost cleverness and forbearance avoid constant difficulties, there are blocks repeatedly; and if you introduce into the middle of such traffic fixed lines, you will effect the greatest amount of inconvenience and damage to the tradesmen in the West End, who find employment for those sempstresses and shop assistants to whom the hon. Member has referred, and if you ruin their trade you injure the very class on whose behalf the hon. Member urges

this Bill. This I am on the question of tramways generally. For the last ten years attempts have been made to carry the tramway lines up such streets as Sloane Street, an impossible street for the purpose, and over and over again the project has been defeated. Now the attempt is made to get communication for the cars over Westminster Bridge, and I suppose in due time the attempt will be made to get up Parliament Street to connect with the northern branches of the lines. On these and other grounds I ask the House to reject the measure as one it is impossible to sanction.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Sir Algernon Borthwick.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

\*(336.) MR. DIXON-HARTLAND (*Middlesex, Uxbridge*): My objection is that the real object is not stated in this Bill, that real object being to make a connection between the northern and southern tramway lines. If this is to be done, then let the proposition be made in an open, straightforward manner. There is no reason why the North and South Metropolitan Tramway System should not be connected, but let it be proposed in a Bill introduced for the purpose, and let us have some voice in the selection of the bridge over which the traffic is to go. The last bridge to select would be Westminster. It is inconvenient, and the bridge is unsuited for such traffic. I have seen the plans of the bridge, and have consulted engineers, who tell me the construction is unfitted for such traffic. The crown of the arches is elliptical and unfitted to bear the heavy traffic in the centre of the road. The bridge was built to accommodate lines of slow, heavy traffic on either side and the quicker traffic in the middle; but if the tramway takes 16 feet from the centre of the roadway it will be impossible to accommodate two streams of traffic on either side. The power is also proposed to be taken to close a portion of the bridge for a certain time pending construction of the line, but meantime what is to become of the traffic? The Embankment was constructed at a great expenditure of public money for a specific purpose, to relieve

the traffic flowing east and west by the Strand then so often blocked. But if this tramway is sanctioned on the Embankment, the effect will be to drive traffic back again to the Strand, for it will be impossible to use the Embankment for carriages. Nothing owners and drivers of carriages dislike more than the twisting of their wheels by the tramway metals, and, equally with the public vehicles, carriages have a right to the use of the roads, for all pay rates. It is evident, also, that something more than horse cars is contemplated, for the Bill includes a clause for regulating the smoke from engines. Will that not prevent all other traffic? Will anyone care to drive along the Embankment passed by puffing engines every two minutes? With regard to the District Railway, undoubtedly it is right that the Company should have a voice in this matter. I was twitted last year with holding a brief for the District Railway Company, though I did nothing of the kind, as I have no connection with that line except as a passenger. But I think, if a public body gives £200,000 towards a public improvement, and directly that is made all the profit is to be taken away by competition promoted by the Local Authority, that is scarcely likely to encourage public bodies to assist municipal improvements in the future. Well, the Bill was thrown out last year by a decisive majority, and I hope the House will not stultify itself by accepting this proposal from a defunct County Council—a proposal which we do not know that the new Council will carry out. It may well be that the new Council may think it has quite enough in hand without entering upon other undertakings. I certainly think such a Bill as this should wait for the opinion of the new Council, and if the Bill is for the purpose of effecting a junction between the northern and southern tramway systems, this is not the bridge for the purpose, because the lines do not come up to the bridge on both sides of the river.

(343.) MR. J. ROWLANDS (*Finsbury, E.*): I have listened with attention to the two speeches made against this Bill, and I fear they are of the class we have long been accustomed to as used against anything like a development of popular traffic. I have failed to recognise one argument or reason against the passing of the Bill. I was astounded

to hear the hon. Member for South Kensington (Sir Algernon Borthwick) argue that the other side of the bridge would not be more inconvenient as a terminus than the end of Villiers Street. You have a dense industrial population coming daily from Brixton, Peckham, and the southern suburbs to employment on the other side of the river, and crossing Westminster Bridge and turning northward many of these people will, by the line indicated in the Bill, be brought within reasonable distance of their place of employment. The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Amendment admits the desirability of connecting the northern and southern tramway systems, but where would he begin his operations for the purpose if not at Westminster Bridge?

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND: There is no tramway system with which to make a junction on the north side of Westminster Bridge.

MR. J. ROWLANDS: No; there is not, I admit that; but will the hon. Gentleman say that he would not equally oppose a plan to carry the northern system over Blackfriars Bridge by way of Farringdon Street? Would there not be exactly the same District Railway monopoly opposition as we meet with now? Am I to suppose the hon. Gentleman would be prepared to endorse a scheme of that kind for crossing Blackfriars Bridge?

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND: That is not the question before us now.

MR. J. ROWLANDS: Just now the hon. Member said there was no reason why the two systems should not be connected, but he objected that there is no connection on the northern side of the bridge, then I ask him would he oppose a plan where the connection could be made at Blackfriars, and he evades the answer. Of course we should meet with the same opposition. I thought I heard the whole of the opposition when I heard of the carriage wheels. We have heard of this skidding of carriage wheels many times. I admit, of course, the equal right of carriages to the use of the roadways, but I deny the right of the owners of carriages to exclude the public conveyances carrying thousands where the carriages carry units. With the argument on behalf of the railway monopoly I need not deal; it is not an argument against the Second

*Mr. J. Rowlands*

Reading of this Bill. The thoroughfare through which the proposed line will run is a wide one, the terminus is a useful one as landing passengers within easy walking distance of the Strand. I am not afraid of another argument which has not to-day been used, that it will spoil the Embankment. I desire to see the cars running along the Embankment, giving the industrial classes the benefit of a ride by the side of the river on a summer's evening for a penny, just as the industrial classes in Paris can ride along the Boulevard des Italiens. (Several hon. MEMBERS: No, no; that is not so.) Yes; I have done it myself—or I should say the Rue de Rivoli. (No, no.) At all events, I desire to see the industrial classes of London able to travel cheaply by the side of the Thames as the people in Paris do by the Seine. I hope that omnibuses may adopt the idea of going along the Embankment. I know of no reason why they should not. What reason is there for opposing this Bill? There is a dense industrial population dwelling at a considerable distance from their employment, and they have to take a public conveyance. But in bad weather they get wet through, having to cross the bridge on foot, and they have to continue their work during the day, and I, from experience, know what it is in wet clothes or with wet feet. I hope hon. Gentlemen will withdraw this opposition, for I can tell them there is only one opinion upon it outside. It may be bias on the part of the people, but it is regarded as class opposition from those who do not themselves need this means of conveyance.

(3.51.) MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I base my opposition on grounds quite other than those which have already been advanced, though I concur in what has been said by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment. My main ground of objection is that this Bill is promoted by the London County Council. ("Hear, hear!") I expected that cheer, but I am not at all afraid to announce at the outset of my observations the ground upon which I make them. I hope to show the House before I have done, and in a few minutes, that this Bill is the thin end of the wedge for proposals which, if carried to their logical conclusion, will be of a colossal description, involving London in Socialistic experiments for extracting capital

from the pockets of those ratepayers who have it and turning it into the pockets of those who have not—to be repaid Heaven knows when. Let me draw attention to Clause 27 in the Bill, which provides that if the Council carries on the undertaking at a loss, then this loss shall be borne by the ratepayers. Not without reason has this clause contemplating a deficiency been introduced. A few weeks ago we had announced to us from public platforms in London what is called the London programme of the Progressists—programmes are fashionable just now—and the programme has attracted some attention. One speech in particular attracted my attention. It was suggested by one speaker, Why should not tramways be taken up by Municipalities and worked even at a loss to the ratepayers in order to accommodate what are called the toiling thousands, although those who would be made to pay are probably as great or greater toilers than they. The votes of these thousands are what is aimed at. That is the principle of which this, I say, is the thin end of the wedge, the first communication in the House, and I ask the House to pause before sanctioning such a principle as that. At another meeting in my constituency, one of the largest divisions in London, this principle was boldly announced by a well-known Socialist representative of his friends on the London County Council, and I suppose, to give it an extra touch of satire, it was said under the portals of the Local Board of Works. Working men in attendance were strongly recommended to organise and to use their votes, first of all, for getting on to the vestry and Local Boards, then on to the Council, and then, by the help of their fellows, into Parliament. For what? To control contracts for labour in London, to organise that labour for the purpose of appointing their own foremen, of fixing their own rate of wages, called a fair rate, but anyhow fixed arbitrarily, by those taking the wages and managed by the exercise of the labour vote, to fix their own hours of labour, or, as it might more properly be called, of non-labour. (Cries of "Question!") I am strictly keeping to the question, for I am proceeding to show that the Bill is simply a first enunciation before Parliament for carrying into effect this doctrine laid down out-of-doors by the party promoting this Bill.

These are the principles underlying the proposals in the Bill. If the Bill passes authorising the construction of one tramway, the precedent will be set and the House will be asked, if one why not ten, if ten why not all tramways? But the programme is not confined to tramways: it is to extend to docks and other undertakings, and the organisation is to extend to the vast army of labourers in this great Metropolis. Having made the London County Council the largest employer of labour in the Metropolis, and presumably in the country, those who secure the employment will, of course, expect the gratitude of this vast army of labourers and their votes to secure Socialistic domination over the whole of society, and over those whom Socialists call the people living at their ease, but whose work in most instances extends over many more hours than the limit labourers fix. Therefore I oppose this Bill. This 'proposal was rejected last year. The principle has often been affirmed that the State should not compete with private enterprise. The principle on which this Bill turns is of a much further reaching character than any mere question of whether or not this little tramway should be made. By Clause 24 the County Council seeks running powers over the whole of the two largest tramways in London—the London Tramways Company and the South London Tramways Company—and to work over and use them on such terms and conditions as, failing agreement, shall be settled by arbitration. The Parliamentary agents who are supporting the Bill say that it is not intended by the Council to work the lines themselves, but to enter into an agreement with a Tramways Company. But I object to private agreements made by Committees of the London County Council behind the back of this House, and smuggled through by a Bill of this kind. The Council would, under that clause, require an army of labourers, inspectors, conductors, and paymasters, and if there were any loss on the working the ratepayers would have to meet the charge. Clause 26 is a very necessary one, if the principle of the Bill be sanctioned, for in it the Council asks for power to spend on capital account, whatever that may mean in County Council finance. But it is not to remain capital; the ratepayers are to

repay it, as if it were a loan, in 60 years. Why should they not raise a million if they are to be the promoters and financial agents of this vast Metropolis, with power to drag, by compulsory powers, out of the pockets of the ratepayers enough money to create industrial undertakings of this kind, and carry them on in competition with private owners? If the County Council, which was to be the Supervisor of the working of tramways, is to be a tramway owner itself, what kind of impartiality will they exercise? If this line is to be made at all, it is well known to commercial men that not only could it be done without charging the ratepayers or taking power to charge them, but it could be done not only with security against any possible loss, but with a very large payment to be made to the ratepayers if the County Council would but act as commercial men do. The Tramway Companies would give a large sum of money to cross the bridge. They would keep the bridge in order, and pay a large sum to the ratepayers annually in aid of the rates. If the line is to be made at all, it should not be made by the County Council, but by somebody else under conditions in which the ratepayers would be indemnified against any loss. For this reason, in addition to those given by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment, I join in their hope that the Bill will be thrown out.

(4.8.) *Mr. COURTNEY* (Cornwall, Bodmin): I think it would be convenient to the House if we were to restrict the Debate to rather narrower limits than did the last speaker. There are some persons now soliciting votes who believe that the whole of the tramways should be taken by the County Council, and worked on a semi-philanthropic and socialistic principle, at a loss, for the benefit of the people of the Metropolis, in somewhat the same way as the Post Office is worked. Whether there be many or few of these persons remains to be seen. I suspect that the number who indulge in these dreams is few. What I would submit to the hon. Member is that the best way to resist foolish proposals is to be sensible ourselves. Let us look at this question in its real dimensions and see what it really means. It is the same proposal as that brought before the House last year and rejected, and it will probably

*Mr. Kimber*

be rejected now. Although it is proposed this year by the County Council and was proposed last year by the Tramways Company, it is practically the same thing. If the Council takes over the tramway, it does so in accordance with what is now the law, which enables it to take over the various lines at intervals of periods. The Bill also contains power for the County Council to come to terms with the Tramway Company so that it will not work the line, but the Tramway Company will do so. The terms between the County Council and the Company are matters which properly come under discussion in Committee upstairs, and they are points which we should enter into. They should be examined by the Committee, if on consideration of the principle of the Bill you do not see a fundamental objection to the construction of the tramway. What we have to consider here is whether there is any fundamental objection to the construction of the tramway. Let us examine that. The circumstances of convenience or inconvenience such that you will entertain the project of a tram being constructed over the bridge and a little way along the Embankment, not further than Charing Cross Bridge—so as not to interfere with the traffic from East to West? If you have such rooted objection to this tramway that you cannot allow the Bill to go upstairs? I asked hon. Members to consider this last year. It is perfectly true that there are no tramways along the Boulevard des Italiennes or the Boulevard de Rivoli; but they are all along the Seine, along the Champs Elysées. Under the Empire they were stopped at Place de la Concorde, but when the Empire was abolished one of the things done was to run them again, they now run between the Louvre and the Seine, which is a very narrow place. They run right through Paris, and the other end of Versailles; and between North and South there is interrupted communication. The tramways run from north to south and from east to west. Can you, with that experience before you, say that you desire all the amenities of London if you allow this tramway to be brought over the bridge and along the Embankment as proposed to carry the line along Charing Cross Bridge? If it is proposed to carry the line along the Strand or any other very busy place

of course, be absurd. But when we have a large space like this, I should send the House — though I am bound to adhere to my original Resolution — to send the Bill upstairs, so that it may be examined.

5.) Mr. KELLY (Camberwell, think, Sir, there is another point we might take with regard to this Bill, that is to adjourn this discussion a month. I will explain why I think that. This is not only not the best time, but it was at that time of last year, but it will be used by the very persons who opposed the Bill last year. I received a letter from the Chairman of the London Tramways Company, in which he says the Company would not, and would not, consent to the conditions the County Council desire to impose, and that the Company would, however, feel it to be their duty to support the Bill in Committee. The

County Council desires to impose the conditions that the Company shall not, in any circumstances, employ a man for more than ten hours a day; but there are many circumstances, such as a great Bank Holiday, when they desire to run every car at the most suitable moment to carry poor people at night; and if they were placed under that restriction it would be impossible for them to carry on their business in their own way, dealing as they find it necessary with their own staff. Their employees, who receive 42s. a week, are contented, and it has been quite impossible to get the great majority of them into any union. We are now trying to decide this question, and in a week's time we may have a Council willing to make reasonable terms with the Tramway Company, which would lead to that which is of the greatest importance to thousands of workmen and poor children who cross the bridge every day, and whom the Tramway Company would carry across it at any further charge whatever.

I am bound to vote for the Second Reading, because I believe that will lead to a settlement between now and the sitting of the Committee which will enable the matter to come to terms. The Tramway Company is willing to build the line or work it for the County Council, paying interest to the ratepayers of the division. The hon. Member for the Hoxton Division held out the Smoke Bill to the House. The Bill provides

that the line shall alone be worked by either animal or electric power, so that I do not see where the hon. Gentleman could get his smoke from. The line over the bridge would be a great convenience to persons driving to Waterloo, for the trams now stop in a narrow and dangerous spot, seriously affecting the traffic, and being a constant source of danger to those leaving and entering the trams. The Embankment is three or four times the breadth, and there would be little danger or trouble in entering or leaving the cars at that place. I regret that we must go to a Division, for I think it is absolutely useless to pass the Second Reading under the present circumstances, as the chairman's letter says the Company will not work the line under the conditions now insisted upon by the County Council. That Body takes power by this Bill to work the proposed line, but surely this is impossible. The line must be worked by the Tramway Company, or it cannot be worked at all. I appeal to the hon. Member for Hoxton to adjourn the Debate for a month, and then we shall have a chance of seeing whether the County Council will or will not come to terms with the Tramway Company, and if they will not, the House will be more than justified in throwing out the Bill.

\*(4.23.) EARL COMPTON (York, W.R., Barnsley): I have no intention of making an electioneering speech, as we are simply discussing whether a certain Bill promoted by the County Council shall be read a second time or not. As regards the matters brought forward by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The smoke difficulty was removed by the last speaker, and the clause referred to is the Board of Trade Clause, which has to be inserted in all such Bills, and I am quite ready to leave that point to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who, I regret, was not here at the commencement of the discussion. We have been told that the traffic would be seriously impeded across Westminster Bridge. There are four lines of traffic over London Bridge, and they are regulated just as if tram lines were laid down, therefore I cannot see where the objection comes in. As to the laying of the lines, I think some statement should be made on behalf of the County Council, as they are not to be laid in the centre of



the bridge, but one line on each side, leaving the centre for the general traffic. The roadway is 54 feet wide, and the two lines for the tramway would take up 14 feet, leaving a 40 feet roadway for the general traffic, which would be ample. We should consider the necessity there is for some tramway communication between the South of London and the rest of the Metropolis. As to the question of finance, it seems to be the impression that it would be a serious matter. The cost would be £10,000. What has been the offer of the Tramway Company? Their offer has been to pay £1,000 a year. Of course there would be expenses, wear and tear and keeping up the line, and they might be calculated at 25 to 30 per cent. at the very outside. There would be no question of loss to the ratepayers of any shape or kind. A great deal has been made of the point that the County Council should have left the question for a future Council to decide. For my own part, I look upon that view with extreme disfavour; I think that it is the duty of a Municipal Body to carry out its work to the last moment, and that it has no right to postpone to its successors a duty which it regards at the present moment as necessary. With regard to the question of spoiling the Embankment, I imagine that the Embankment was made for the use of the ratepayers of London, that it should be used for their convenience, and that it should be left to them to determine what use to make of it. The argument has been used that the tramway would be competing with the Underground Railway. But that argument would mean that we are to have no more tramways or omnibuses at all. As a matter of fact, what is wanted is competition, and why should we not have it? Some hon. Members opposite seem to hold that everything proposed by the London County Council must be wrong, and I must confess regret that Party opposition has resulted in Party fights in elections for the London County Council. The London County Council knows that the districts of South London, which would be affected by this Bill, are unanimous in favour of it, and we have only done our duty in bringing it forward. I should like to call the attention of the House to Clause 5, by which it is laid down explicitly that if the work is

*Earl Compton*

not done in three years the matter will lapse. Therefore it will be in the power of the new County Council to decide whether they will go on with it or not, and the term would come to an end during their tenure of office.

SIR A. BORTHWICK: The Underground Railway paid £200,000 for the privilege of going along the Embankment.

(4.40.) MR. E. BOULNOIS (Marblebone, E.): I wish to say a few words upon the subject, but I do not desire to go into the matter of competition as to which these tramways and omnibuses will be subjected. I wish to say a few words from the point of view taken by the minority of the Council against the course adopted by the Council of constructing tramways. The hon. Member for Shoreditch has stated that the County Council does not desire to work the tramways, but to enter into an arrangement with the Tramway Company by which the latter should work it. I do not believe that it would be possible for the present County Council to enter into such an agreement with Tramway Companies, because, as we all know, it insists upon such terms as to wages paid and the length of hours worked as that would be absolutely impossible for the Company to entertain such proposals and pay its way. The minority of the Council object very strongly to the Council working those tramways. I admit there is a large majority in favour of taking them over and leasing them, but there has been a distinct undertaking given that there should be no attempt made to work them. With regard to the estimated cost of this undertaking, since the question of the acquisition of tramways has been discussed in this House last year, the County Council has given notice to the Tramway Company to purchase a very small piece of line. That purchase has been carried out upon the estimate made by the valuer of the Council, and it is now rumoured that a claim six or seven times as large as the estimate made by the valuer has been sent in by the Tramway Company. I think, therefore, it is necessary to accept the noble Lord's statement as to cost with caution. What I ask the House to do is to give time. This is purely an experiment, and I think the House should pause before allowing such an undertaking to be put

ly forced upon the successors of the  
nt County Council.

45.) MR. CREMER (Shoreditch,  
gerston): The opposition to this  
comes from two classes of Mem-  
—those who are actuated by an  
use hatred of the London County  
cil and all its acts, and those  
can afford to ride in carriages and  
and who disregard the wants of  
nasses, who must ride in omnibuses  
ramways or walk. The conditions  
h the London County Council desire  
npose upon the Tramway Company  
o my mind rational and wholesome.  
e conditions are that the Company  
ld pay their servants fair wages, and  
the hours of work should be limited  
n hours a day.

MR. KELLY: I wish to explain that  
e is no condition affecting the wages  
paid. The servants of the Company  
always been contented with the  
as they received, and they have  
sed to join in the union.

MR. CREMER: The statement that  
ndition as to wages was to be imposed  
been made by at least two hon.  
nbers upon the other side of the  
se, and if such a condition is not  
ained in the Bill the hon. Mem-  
have been misleading the House.  
elieve that the poorer ratepayers  
London have made up their  
d that the control of the tram-  
s should be in charge of the  
don County Council. Hundreds and  
ands of people living upon the  
r side of the Thames are most anxious  
vail themselves of the increased  
ities of locomotion which would be  
died by this Bill, and I confidently  
that if the opponents of the Bill  
sed in defeating it they will regret  
action before long. Depend upon it  
the new County Council will insist  
i harder conditions than the present  
cil seek to impose upon the Tram-  
Companies, and I believe it is quite  
ible that they will be supported in  
demand by a Liberal House of  
mons.

50.) MR. WEBSTER (St. Pan-  
E.): I think there can be no doubt  
the construction of a tramway on  
minster Bridge would seriously  
fere with the traffic. There is, in  
no room on the bridge for a tram-  
. If there were any widespread  
re for a tramway along this

route I should say that the  
best proof of it would be to see omnibuses  
running along the same route, for it may  
be taken for granted that where the  
public wish to go there the omnibuses  
will be found. But we find none along  
this route; along the Embankment you  
seldom see an omnibus, and I take it  
that that is the best proof that the route  
is not desired for the purpose. Why  
was the Embankment constructed? I  
take it that it was not built for the use  
of a few people who want to go to the  
South of the Thames from Charing Cross,  
but rather for the general benefit of the  
people. Besides, it cannot be said that  
it is for the benefit of the public gene-  
rally; for there are but few shops in the  
neighbourhood of Charing Cross. The  
Embankment was constructed for the  
general benefit of the whole of London, and  
I, for one, must protest against its being  
applied to the use of any particular class.  
The Embankment was spoken of as a  
great boulevard, and hon. Gentlemen  
referred to Paris, but they will find that  
in Paris there is no line of tramway  
running over any bridge. In Paris there  
may be a line of tramway running along  
the side of a bridge, but there is none  
running over it. Hon. Gentlemen want  
to have a tram line running along the  
Embankment in order that there might  
be better communication established with  
North London in the most congested dis-  
tricts. If they want to have communication  
established from North to South London  
it certainly ought not to be over West-  
minster Bridge.

MR. CREMER: Might I interrupt  
the hon. Gentleman for a moment with  
reference to what he said about Paris?  
There are at least two tramway lines in  
Paris running across bridges.

MR. WEBSTER: Then I beg the hon.  
Gentleman's pardon. But referring to  
London, I wish to point out to the  
hon. Gentleman who sneered at the state-  
ment that carriage wheels were injured  
by tramway lines, that carriage wheels  
are injured, and so are cab wheels, and  
so are omnibus wheels, and so are light  
car's and dray's wheels injured, and  
so are fire engines' wheels injured. I  
venture to say that the tramway line  
there is not wanted, that it is not  
required, and that it will destroy the  
beauty and all the interest of that noble  
boulevard, the Thames Embankment.  
Hon. Gentlemen opposite may also wish

to use the open spaces along the Embankment, which were made by the late Leader of the House. Hon. Gentlemen in their Communistic wishes may desire to have gasometers erected there. I am opposed to this Bill on principle, and, further, I am opposed to it because I say, as a London Member, that a tram line is not wanted on the Thames Embankment.

\*MR. A. J. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): It seems to me deplorable that the time of the House should be wasted with discussing a matter so small as this, a proposal relating to a tramway line which is promoted by the London County Council, and which does not extend to the length of three-fourths of a mile. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have spoken of this as a Socialistic movement, and as the introduction of the thin end of the wedge. I was very much surprised to hear this from the hon. Member for the Wandsworth Division, because I remember that this movement is only a small part of a scheme which was promoted in this House more than 20 years ago. It was not promoted by Socialists then; it was not denounced then as a Socialistic movement; it was promoted by the London Tramways Company. It was opposed by Mr. Beresford Hope, who sat on this side of the House, and he conjured up before the House all the horrors which have been referred to by the hon. Baronet the Member for the South Kensington Division, and spoke of trams being allowed to run down Piccadilly, and down the Strand, and going along and destroying the Thames Embankment. Really, this is a matter extending over a distance of under five furlongs.

An hon. MEMBER: Eight miles of running power.

MR. MUNDELLA: That is the running power that the London Tramways Company wanted to get at that time. But what we want is to get the control of the tramways. The Metropolitan Board of Works opposed them because they wanted entire control of the tramways; the Metropolitan Board of Works contemplated what I hope the London County Council contemplate—getting complete control, not to work them; but as the streets are the property of the citizens of London, they should be under the control of the Local Authorities of London. We do

*Mr. Webster*

these things in the Provinces. Sheffield controls the tramways, so does Liverpool and many other large towns. We have control of the tramways, because it may be necessary to change or divert the line of a street and prove it, and it is right that the Municipality should have complete control over it. I never heard such an argument as this on a Private Bill in this House—that this Bill should not be sent up in the usual course to a Committee upstairs because there was an election coming on. It is the first time that such an argument has been advanced in this House. Just fancy saying “Oh! throw out the Nottingham Improvement Bill, or the Liverpool Improvement Bill; they will have an election in November, and then there will be a change in the views of the constituency.” Why these arguments are monstrous, and I think they hardly justify the waste of time the House has put to in this matter. What are the facts? There are 60,000 ratepayers in South London praying the House to make this small improvement. The right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means has made a brief but very powerful and important speech in favour of sending it to a Committee upstairs. Every argument that has been advanced against this measure is an argument that ought to be addressed to a Committee upstairs. That is the proper tribunal to try. It is mischievous to the last degree that the House should take this matter into its own hands, and should refuse to consider the wants of any Municipality, and should further refuse to send the matter before the ordinary tribunal. As to what the hon. Baronet the Member for South Kensington said about the mischief done by tramways, he has heard from the Chairman of Ways and Means what takes place in Paris, and Brussels too.

(5.) SIR ALGERNON BORTHWICK

I wish to say that I oppose this Bill on behalf of the West End Ratepayers' Association, who have successfully defeated a series of these measures introduced notably by the very persons whom the right hon. Gentleman alluded to. About ten years ago it was proposed to bring this very tramway across Westminster Bridge, up Victoria Street, and also up Sloane Square.

**Mr. MUNDELLA:** And who are the West End Ratepayers' Association? Let me ask the right hon. Baronet what right have the West End Ratepayers' Association to interfere with a proposal for bringing a tramway line from South London across Westminster Bridge, or to take up the time of the House in opposition to the 60,000 ratepayers who have petitioned in favour of the proposal? After all, it is a question to be decided by a Committee upstairs.

**Mr. WEBSTER:** I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question. (Cries of "Order, order!") I want to know whether the Petition was presented this year or not?

**Mr. MUNDELLA:** The real question is—shall this Bill be referred to a Committee upstairs? During the last 24 years that I have been in this House it has always been the custom to send Bills of this kind before a Committee upstairs. That is the proper way, and I hope this House will not stand in the way of an important improvement promoted by a Local Authority which the Government itself has set up. I trust we shall go at once to a Division.

(5.13.) **SIR CHARLES C. FRASER** (Lambeth, N): I beg leave to trespass on the time of the House for a few moments. I shall stand closely to the question. I shall not wander to Paris, and I do not "come from Sheffield." I wish to have an intimate acquaintance with Westminster Bridge and its neighbourhood, and would give evidence as a Member for North Lambeth, which I am proud to be, on which one end of the bridge rests. I would draw attention to a new feature in this Bill. Last year it was proposed to take the tramcars from Westminster Bridge Road over Westminster Bridge; this year it is proposed to take the Albert Embankment tramcars—which at present stop well short of the bridge and road—round St. Thomas's Hospital, so that both lines will converge on the bridge—to the great detriment of trade and traffic. The noble Lord the Member for Ramsey (Lord Compton) has pictured four gentle streams gliding smoothly side by side over the bridge under the guidance of the County Council. I doubt it, and would leave his lordship on the bridge and pass to the Westminster end of it, where the two lines of trams will have to turn sharply

to the right on to the Victoria Embankment. At this point the flood of traffic from Victoria Street, Great George Street, Parliament Street, through Bridge Street, pour down and must cause great danger and difficulty. Every Member at the present time recognises that but for the attention of the police in Bridge Street we should all be killed every afternoon. I would not trespass on the time of the House; I would not speak of the County Council or of Socialists, of those who loll in gilded chariots, or of the working men who, full of health and life, trudge to their work like Englishmen, but I would ask the House to focus its interest on those who have not those advantages when they face the dangers of the streets, and ask it to stay the advance of the uncompromising tram-car.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 160; Noes 158.—(Div. List, No. 9.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

#### QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE COMPTROLLER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (LORD ARTHUR HILL) reported to the House, That Her Majesty, having been attended with their Address of the 15th day of this instant February, was pleased to receive the same very graciously, and to give the following Answer:—

I thank you most sincerely for your loyal and dutiful Address, and especially for your expressions of sympathy with Me and My Family in the deep affliction which has visited Us.

Your heartfelt participation in My personal sorrow has afforded me much consolation.

#### BELFAST CORPORATION (LUNATIC ASYLUMS, &c.) BILL.

Ordered, That the Order for Committee be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be nominated by the House and three by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented three clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—  
(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
“That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert in the Bill clauses re-arranging the existing division of the City of Belfast into wards, so as to make it possible for all classes of its inhabitants to obtain representation in the Town Councils.”—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

And, the Motion being opposed,  
Further Proceeding stood adjourned until To-morrow.

### QUESTIONS.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN TRINIDAD.

MR. ALFRED PEASE (York): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a Commission of Inquiry has been sanctioned by the Colonial Office to inquire into charges made against the First Puisne Judge, and into the administration of justice in the Islands of Trinidad; and, if so, whether he can state the nature of the charges preferred against the Chief Justice; and whether the cost of defence before such a Commission would be thrown individually on the Chief Justice and other persons; and, if so, in view of the great expense that must be incurred in any attempt to prove that the daily duties of an official have been faithfully discharged over a course of years, and that all his judgments have been reasonable, whether the cost of defence could be defrayed out of public funds instead of out of the private estates of the officials whose conduct will be under investigation, and to whom the payment of such costs must necessarily be extremely burdensome if not disastrous?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer the question. The Secretary of State has decided on the appointment of a Committee to inquire into charges made against the First Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Trinidad and Tobago, and into the administration of justice in those Islands. Complaints have been made against the Chief Justice of receiving in Chambers irregular applications from, and giving

advice to, intending litigants; of allowing persons to sue *in forma pauperis* without the evidence of poverty required by law of preventing mortgagees from realising their securities, and keeping the mortgaged property for long periods under the control of Receivers appointed by the Court; of making orders unsupported by any evidence; of using insulting and intemperate language, and intimidating parties, witnesses and jurors and of abuse of the power of the Court to punish for contempt of Court. Upon the Report of the Commission about to be appointed has been received and considered by Her Majesty's Government opinion can be expressed on the question whether any expense which the Chief Justice, or any other persons whose conduct is impugned, may have incurred in defending themselves before the Commission should be recouped to them from the public funds of the Colony.

#### SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION AT ENFIELD.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, 1): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the number of existing school places in the parish of Enfield is now 4,300, and whether, in view of the facts that last year's Census showed a population in the parish of 31,532, and that on the Departmental basis of one-sixth of the population the number of school places required would be 5,255, he will state what steps the Department has taken, or proposes to take, to secure that this deficiency of 884 places be supplied without delay. The hon. Gentleman had also to ask the following question on the Paper:—“I ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the population of the district of Bush Hill Park, in the parish of Enfield, is now about 3,600; that in the district there is only one small infant school; that the London Road School is the nearest school for older scholars, is a mile and a quarter distant from Bush Hill Park; and that many of the children from Bush Hill Park have to cross a level crossing on the Great Eastern Railway in order to reach it; and whether he will take immediate steps to have suitable school provision made for this district?”

**THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL** (Sir W. HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford): As the hon. Member has two questions dealing with the same subject, it will be for the convenience of the House that I should answer them together. When the results of the Census were known, the Department became aware of a deficiency, though not to the extent assumed in the question; but no pressure upon the existing supply was experienced until the Free Education Act came into operation. Since the calculation of the number of school places given by the hon. Member enlargements providing for more than 150 children have been sanctioned, and others are in preparation. A site for a new school in the Bush Hill Park district has been approved, and the plans will be submitted in the course of a few days. It is confidently expected that by the end of the summer the whole ground will be covered, and the Inspector reports that even now there is no difficulty in finding room for all the older children who are under the obligation to attend school.

#### DEATH RETURNS IN SCOTTISH POOR-HOUSES.

**MR. HALLEY STEWART** (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether there is any official Return giving the number of deaths in the Poorhouses of Scotland; and, if not, whether he will amend the form of the "Abstract of Poorhouse Returns," by requiring the Returns to be made in separate columns of the persons now accounted for as "Died or discharged"?  
**THE LORD ADVOCATE** (Sir C. J. PARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I am informed that the Abstract to which the hon. Member refers gives the number of deaths in the sick wards in each poorhouse, but does not include those rare cases of sudden deaths which occur in the ordinary wards. The Board of Supervision are considering whether the Abstract can be conveniently amended so as to show the total number of deaths.

#### THE PROPOSED GALLERY OF BRITISH PICTURES.

**SIR ALGERNON BORTHWICK** (Kensington, S.): On behalf of my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea  
 VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

(Mr. Whitmore), I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can state what progress has been made in the negotiations with Mr. Henry Tate for the erection of a gallery for British pictures?

**THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS** (Mr. D. R. PLUNKET, Dublin University): I am still in correspondence upon this subject, and I must ask my hon. Friend to postpone his question for a week.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH CONVICTS.

**MR. GIBBS** (London): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Government has been called to an extract from a Report of a Commission sent by the Government of the United States to inquire into the subject of immigration into the United States, in which the following paragraph appears:—

"There is a systematic landing on the shores of the United States of the convicts of Great Britain, and from England, Ireland, and Scotland. During the last eleven years there has been a wide-spread and thoroughly organised movement, known, encouraged, and patronised by the Government of Great Britain, for the purpose of sending convicts and ex-convicts to the United States";

and whether it is the intention of the Government to make a representation in regard to this statement?

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Her Majesty's Government have not received the Report referred to, but Sir J. Pauncefoot has been requested to procure it and send it home as soon as it is published. A similar allegation was made in 1889 by a United States Select Committee on Foreign Immigration, and it was then pointed out to the United States Government that the statement was devoid of foundation.

#### POSTAGE OF VOTING CARDS.

**MR. ERNEST SPENCER** (West Bromwich): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is prepared to allow polling cards to pass at the halfpenny rate, with the voter's number on the register written thereon?

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): No, Sir; it must be printed.

MADRAS PRESIDENCY FAMINE  
STATISTICS.

MR. MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he can define the areas in the Madras Presidency in which distress and famine pressure prevail, and fix the dates since which remedial measures, such as relief works, kitchens, &c. have been opened; what are the dates on which scarcity was first apprehended, taking the dates on which restrictions in water supply were officially directed in the districts affected as the basis; what was the normal death-rate in the areas referred to in 1890, and what is the death-rate in the same areas since 1st July, 1891; and what scale of diet is doled out of relief kitchens?

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CURZON, Lincolnshire, Southport): Broadly speaking, the areas are those mentioned in the Official Telegrams, published every week in the newspapers since July. The affected districts are: Bellary, Kurnool, Salem, Chingleput, Nellore, Anantapur, Cuddapah, Coimbatore, North Arcot, South Arcot. In parts of Chingleput and of some other districts relief works were opened in July, and some little gratuitous relief was also given. In Bellary and the Deccan districts generally relief works began in November, and gratuitous relief began in the last week of December. The Secretary of State has received no Report as to the dates on which the supply of water for irrigation purposes may have been restricted. The last Return of deaths received is the monthly Return for August, which gives the following results per 1,000 as compared with the death-rate of 1890: Bellary, 49 against 26; Salem, 23 against 25; Nellore, 26 against 16; Cuddapah, 40 against 24; Kurnool, 59 against 29; Chingleput, 34 against 24; Anantapur, 52 against 26; Coimbatore, 26 against 21; North Arcot, 29 against 22; South Arcot, 34 against 26. The scale of diet at the Relief Kitchen is settled upon the provisions of the Famine Code, which prescribe 22 oz. of grain to 28 drachms of condiments as the minimum for an adult. The minimum can be increased at the discretion of the Medical Officer attached to the Relief House.

## THE NEW LETTER CARDS.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he hopes to receive an additional surplus from the Post Office by the sale of the new letter cards, which are sold at ten for a shilling; if so, can he state the estimated amount?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The letter cards are costly to manufacture, and the Inland Revenue estimate that the difference between the manufacturer's charge and the price at which the cards are sold to the public is approximately only sufficient to cover the cost of distribution.

THE CROFTERS' ACT AND THE  
CROFTERS' COMMISSION.

MR. FRASER - MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, by the Crofters' Act of 1886, Sections 21 and 25, the sole and final power of determining who is a crofter within the meaning of the Act lies with the Crofter Commissioners; whether his attention has been directed to the case of "*Stewarts v. Macleod*," and particularly the remarks of Lord MacLaren, decided in the Second Division of the Court of Session on 9th December, 1891, where the Court overruled the decision of the Crofters' Commissioners and of the Lord Ordinary; and whether steps will be taken, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent these matters, which have been declared by Act of Parliament not subject to appeal or review, being brought before the Courts of Law?

\*SIR C. J. PEARSON: I understand the question to refer to a decision of the First Division of the Court on 8th December, 1891. It is not the case that the Court overruled a decision of the Crofters' Commission. The question arose in a bankruptcy proceeding, which originated in the Supreme Court, and which was founded upon a civil debt constituted by a previous Judgment of that Court. The sections quoted from the Crofters' Act do not debar the Supreme Court from determining whether a person is a crofter when that question arises in the exercise of its ordinary jurisdiction. It does not appear to me that any change in the law is called for.

**DR. CLARK (Caithness):** Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that it was the intention of Parliament to give full powers to the Crofters' Commission to determine those matters, so as to prevent them going further.

**\*SIR C. J. PEARSON:** I cannot gather the intention of Parliament otherwise than from the words of the Act, and these are in accordance with the answer I have given.

#### SCOTCH MAIL CONTRACTS.

**MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH:** I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, for the satisfaction of the great number of people interested, he will consent to publish the terms of the specifications for the new contracts for carriage of mails in the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** These services will very shortly be advertised, and the forms of conditions of tender will be given to any persons who may apply for them.

#### THE PHILIPSTOWN EVICTIONS AND THE POLICE.

**MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.):** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state by whose authority and for what purpose collectors engaged recently in receiving subscriptions for evicted tenants in the parish of Philipstown, King's County, were accompanied from house to house by the police?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.):** The Constabulary Authorities report that they had reason to believe that attempts would be made to intimidate persons who were unwilling to subscribe to the collection being made. Two constables were accordingly detailed for duty, so that their services would be available if required.

#### CLERKS TO GUARDIANS AND TO MAGISTRATES.

**MR. COLMAN (Norwich):** I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that in many rural districts the same person is Clerk to the Local Board of Guardians and also Clerk to the Local Bench of Magistrates, and thus advises the Guardians as to the prosecution of defaulters under

the Vaccination Acts, and subsequently advises the Magistrates as to the penalties and sentences to be inflicted on the same persons; and whether he will issue instructions to Boards of Guardians that their clerks cannot hold the office of Magistrates' Clerk to any Bench having jurisdiction over persons ordered to be prosecuted by such Board?

**\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's):** There are no doubt cases where the Clerks to Guardians, who are solicitors, act also as Clerks to Justices. As regards the proceedings to which the question refers, it does not in any way devolve on the clerks to determine whether the prosecutions should be instituted by the Guardians, and it is for the Justices to determine whether the offence has been proved. The advice which the Clerk to the Justice can give as to the penalties which can be imposed in case of a conviction cannot be affected by the fact that he holds the office of Clerk to the Guardians. The two offices of Clerk to the Guardians and Clerk to the Justice are not, in my opinion, incompatible. I could not propose to make it unlawful that one person should hold the two offices.

#### THE VACCINATION COMMISSION.

**MR. CHANNING:** I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the long time that the Royal Commission on Vaccination has sat, he will inquire whether there are any points upon which the Commission is prepared to furnish a preliminary Report, with special reference to the question of cumulative penalties?

**\*MR. RITCHIE:** I have communicated with the Commissioners, and I learn that the matter will receive their consideration.

**MR. BALLANTINE (Coventry):** I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government will introduce a Bill for the purpose of suspending prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts until the Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination has been issued?

**\*MR. RITCHIE:** It is not my intention to introduce a Bill for the purpose of suspending prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts.



## TELEGRAPHIC MONEY ORDERS.

**MR. HENNIKER HEATON** (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he will consider the advisability of simplifying the system of telegraphic money orders, and the form of such orders; whether he can see his way to a reduction of the charge for such orders; and whether he will direct that the money shall be delivered at the residence of the person to whom the telegraph money order is payable, with a view to ensure speed, and to guard against mistake or fraud?

\***SIR JAMES FERGUSSON**: It is not thought that the system can at present be made more simple. It follows that of postal money orders. It will be extended on the 1st of March to all offices open both for money order and for telegraph business, and the instructions have been revised. A certain reduction of charge will then take place—namely, when one remitter sends more than one order at the same time to one recipient up to £50 only one telegram of advice will be required. It is not thought expedient to alter the rule by which the recipient must claim the money at the paying office, which affords the security against fraud. The limited experiment hitherto made has shown an increasing popularity and few complaints, the number of telegraphic money orders having reached 10,673 in the last quarter as compared with 7,409 in the corresponding quarter of last year.

## THE SASINE OFFICE CLERKS.

**MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH**: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is prepared to make the statement, in regard to the clerks in the Sasine Office, Edinburgh, promised by his predecessor on 27th July, 1891?

**THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY** (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am not able to discover what particular information the hon. Member desires; but if he will formulate the questions he wishes to put, I will endeavour to answer them.

## EAST INDIA COMPANY PENSIONERS.

**MR. SEXTON** (Belfast, W.): On behalf of my hon. Friend the Member for North Longford (Mr. T. M. Healy), I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State

for India if pensioners of the late East India Company can have the option of commuting, like pensioners in the Regular Army?

**MR. CURZON**: Military pensioners of the late East India Company have the same privileges as to commuting as pensioners in the Regular Army.

## THE "SANITARY RATE" IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

**MR. KNOX** (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with reference to the proposal in Clause 42 of the Local Government (Ireland) Bill to throw the whole sanitary rate, over and above a limit to be fixed by the Local Government Board, upon the tenant, notwithstanding existing contracts and Statutes to the contrary, he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the rate now levied for sanitary purposes in each union and division in Ireland; and whether there is any precedent for the proposal to allow a Government Department to fix the incidence of a rate?

**MR. JACKSON**: I am not aware that there will be any difficulty in granting the Return indicated, if the hon. Member will move for it in the usual way. The subject-matter of the second paragraph is one that can more properly be discussed when the Local Government Bill is under the consideration of the House.

## SCOTCH RAILWAY MONOPOLY.

**MR. BUCHANAN** (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will ensure that the agreement between the Caledonian and North British Railways, by which almost the whole railway system of Scotland will be placed in the hands of a monopoly, and new and independent railway enterprise seriously checked, will be submitted to the judgment of the House?

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I have not seen the agreement to which the hon. Member refers. If it comes within the meaning of Section 22 of the Railway Clauses Act of 1863, the approval of the Railway Commissioners will be necessary before it comes into effect;

but whether this is, or is not, the case is not for me to determine. I have no jurisdiction in the matter, and cannot ensure that it shall be brought before Parliament.

#### DUNDRUM LUNATIC ASYLUM.

**MR. SEXTON:** On behalf of my hon. Friend (Mr. T. M. Healy) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if a vacancy has been allowed, since July, 1890, to exist in Dundrum Lunatic Asylum for the post of head attendant; whether a temporary appointment was made from outside the service; and is it intended to deprive experienced officers of the chance of promotion by making the temporary appointment permanent?

**MR. JACKSON:** The vacancy in Dundrum Lunatic Asylum referred to is temporarily filled in the manner stated in the question. When a permanent appointment is being made to the post, the qualifications of all the candidates will receive due consideration.

#### RAILWAY FREE TELEGRAMS.

**MR. J. E. ELLIS** (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Postmaster General what number of telegraphic messages were transmitted by the State on account of the Railway Companies, and free of charge to them, during the years 1888, 1889, 1890, and 1891 respectively?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** The numbers of telegrams sent free by the Post Office on account of the Railway Companies in the years 1888 to 1891 respectively are as follows:—1888, 1,033,433; 1889, 1,196,596; 1890, 1,406,398; 1891, 1,571,803. The above figures refer to the telegrams sent free on behalf of Railway Companies only, that being the information asked for. But it is right that I should state that several Canal Companies' also possess the right to send free telegrams, and that some Railway Companies—notably the Irish Railway Companies—have the privilege of sending telegrams at a reduced rate.

#### STERN LIGHTS ON SEA-GOING VESSELS.

**MR. MORTON** (Peterborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the accidents caused by vessels being run down, he

can have the regulations altered so as to make it compulsory for all British vessels to carry stern lights at sea as well as in the rivers?

**\*SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH:** The proposal of the hon. Member was adopted by the Washington International Maritime Conference, and has subsequently been approved by the Board of Trade in the amended International Regulations for preventing collisions at sea, submitted to Foreign Governments for consideration. I hope, therefore, that it may be included in the revised regulations when these have received International acceptance.

#### IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

**MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton) had a notice on the Paper to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that John Charlton, of Lingdale, Yorkshire, labourer, aged 70, was sued for a debt of a little above £5, and that an order was obtained for payment of 5s. per week; that these payments were regularly made until more than £5 had been paid in reduction of the debt; that, being out of work in the latter part of last year, he was unable to keep up the weekly payments, and that a judgment summons for two instalments was taken out, returnable at Guisborough on 20th November, 1891; that on that day Charlton attended at Guisborough to plead his inability to pay, owing to the fact that he was out of work, and was then, and had been since the 20th of October previous, in the receipt of parochial relief; and that he states that he went away on the assurance of the plaintiff's agent that the case would be withdrawn; that, on the case being called, the plaintiff's agent said that Charlton had told him that he had only had two weeks' relief, and that on this statement a committal order was granted; that the Relieving Officer has certified that Charlton was in receipt of relief from 20th October, 1891, until 9th February, he was arrested by the County Court bailiff as he came away from the relieving officer after receiving his weekly allowance, and conveyed to prison, where he now is; and whether, in view of the fact that Charlton's only means were those which he received as parochial relief, and that his wife cannot

earn money for him, being 65 years old and suffering from disease of the heart and an abscess, he will see that the man is at once released? On the question being reached the hon. Gentleman said: I may say that I have just received a telegram stating this man has been let out. In view of the fact that he seems to have been imprisoned on perjured evidence, I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman will take action?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): I can only say that I have no power in the matter.

#### CONSTABLE GURRY.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the grounds on which Constable Gurry, recently stationed at Tipperary, has been promoted to the rank of acting sergeant and removed to Clonmel; whether he has any objection to state the length of Gurry's service, the number of stations he has been in, the cause of his removal from each station, and his general conduct record; and by whom was he first recommended for promotion to the rank he now holds, and was he recommended for promotion by his superior officers?

MR. JACKSON: The Constabulary Authorities report that the acting sergeant referred to was promoted to his present rank on the recommendation of his superior officers. He has served through the exigencies of the Service at various places, and has been in the Royal Irish Constabulary ten and a half years. His general conduct record is good.

#### THE MULLINGAR BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. TUIE (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Mullingar Board of Guardians, having several years since paid out of their general funds the cost of obtaining the Private Act, 48 & 49 Vic. c. 131, enabling the town of Mullingar to be supplied with water, by a majority of two votes, struck a special rate on 18th February instant, of 3s. 8d. in the £1, to recoup by one levy the general

*Mr. Labouchere*

fund, though their powers under the Act have been abandoned, and no works were ever constructed under it; and that this was done after the Board had been advised by their counsel that such a rate would be illegal, in view of Sections 31 and 41, which provide that the money for the purpose should be first borrowed; whether he is also aware that the Guardians are now unable to define the boundary of the area of taxation, namely, "the town and manor of Mullingar"; and whether the Local Government Board intend to take any action in the matter?

MR. JACKSON: The facts are generally as stated in the first part of the question. The matter is altogether a question of law, and the Guardians appear to be acting under the advice of their counsel. The Local Government Board do not propose to interfere.

#### THE IRISH CAPITATION GRANT AND MODEL SCHOOLS.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the teachers of model schools were excluded from the capitation grant arising from the £78,000 derived from "The Customs and Excise Act, 1890"; whether the model school teachers in contributory unions receive the same proportion of results fees from the poor rate as the teachers of other national schools; and whether Her Majesty's Government will authorise the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland to pay to the model school teachers in non-contributory unions, out of the £2,000 derived from the fees paid by the pupils who attend the model schools, and now paid into the Treasury as an extra receipt, the same capitation grant as is paid to the teachers in other national schools?

MR. JACKSON: The reply to the inquiries in paragraphs 1 and 2 is in the affirmative. With regard to the third paragraph, the arrangement made by the Treasury with regard to the application of the item of £2,000 mentioned is one which I have no power to alter.

#### BALACLAVA VETERANS.

MR. OCTAVIUS V. MORGAN (Battersea): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that of the soldiers who fought at

Balaclava there are 18 alive who have no pensions, and that there are 12 who have pensions varying from 4d. to 1s. 3d. a day; and whether Her Majesty's Government will take the necessary steps to provide that each of these heroes shall, for the rest of his days, enjoy a pension of not less than 2s. 6d. a day?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (MR. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): As I have already stated more than once, the Balaclava Charge, gallant as it was, was but one incident in many actions which took place during the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns, and I cannot discriminate specially in its favour. As I have also already said, the Treasury is now considering whether it will be possible to effect a reduction in the length of service qualifying for pension, so as to benefit many of the men now without a pension. I cannot, however, hold out any hope that the pensions will be generally raised to the high figure suggested in the question.

MR. SWIFT MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it has been stated in the newspapers, and not contradicted, that no fewer than six of the survivors of the Charge of Balaclava are at present in workhouses in various parts of the country?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: I am not aware of that fact, if it be a fact; but I do know that the Patriotic Commissioners, whose duty it is to inquire into the matter, satisfied themselves that there were a few men who had brought that condition upon themselves by drunkenness and misconduct.

MR. M'CARTAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state, with reference to the survivors of the Six Hundred who took part in the charge at Balaclava, how many of them died in the workhouse, and how many of them are at present in workhouses; and whether the Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund have yet, in accordance with the Report of February, 1891, disposed of the £3,700 balance of the Relief Fund raised in the summer of 1890?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: I have not information which will enable me to reply to the first part of the question; but, considering that, with few exceptions, these men received gratuities exceeding a year's pension, I can scarcely imagine that there ought now to be

any serious destitution among them. The balance of the Relief Fund has only recently been transferred to the Patriotic Fund, and amounted to £2,949; and it is intended to apply it in the grant of pensions of 1s. a day to each of seven men as long as so many survive.

#### LICENCES IN MORTMAIN.

MR. ROBY (Lancashire, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, on an application being received for a licence in mortmain under 51 and 52 Vic. c. 42, any consideration is given to the question whether such licence is legally necessary to save the property intended to be conveyed from forfeiture?

MR. MATTHEWS: The Attorney General, to whom every petition for the grant of a licence to mortmain is referred for report, gives due consideration, among other circumstances, to the legal necessity for a licence in order to save forfeiture. The gift of lands to Owens College was licensed on the ground that purposes of public benefit and utility would be promoted by the grant of the licence. The fees charged are solely for Revenue purposes. Twelve licences have been granted since the passing of the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act of 1888.

#### INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, under the regulations of the Intermediate Education Board in Ireland, no examining centre will be established, under the Intermediate Education Act, in any part of Ireland, unless there are at least 20 pupils presented there for examination; and, if so, whether, in view of the difficulty of presenting such a number in the smaller rural towns, and the little difficulty and small expense of providing superintendents to preside over the examinations, the Government will bring it under the notice of the Board with a view to reduce the requisite minimum number to ten or twelve; and whether he is aware that it frequently happens that a number of pupils are brought (under the superintendence of the teachers) at great expense from a considerable distance to the examining

centres, and maintained there at further expense during the period over which the examination extends.

MR. JACKSON: I learn from the Intermediate Education Board that they have no fixed rule as to the number of candidates required to constitute a centre, but that each application is considered on its merits. The Board do not consider it would be advisable to adopt as a minimum the number ten or twelve, as in their opinion the doing so would largely increase the cost of superintendence.

MR. FLYNN: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of the question?

MR. JACKSON: I have no information on that point.

#### THE DEBT ON KINSALE HARBOUR.

MR. MORROGH (Cork Co., S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can explain on what grounds the Irish Board of Works claim that the Kinsale Harbour Commissioners are indebted to them in the sum of £11,059 15s. 1d., this sum being made up of principal and interest, the latter being charged at the rate of 5 per cent.; and is he aware that the Board of Works have issued a writ for the recovery of this amount, and have threatened to appoint a receiver; that the Town Commissioners, in order to meet what they considered their portion of the liability, levied a special extra rate of 2s. in the £, which they find the ratepayers of the town are unable to meet; and that the Harbour Commissioners have applied for a Provisional Order to enable them to increase the Harbour dues for the purpose of meeting the payments, according to terms of the award of the Board of Works, dated 23rd April, 1890; if so, will he take into consideration the advisability of reducing the rate of interest, and also make a reduction in the principal sum, in view of the fact that a high rate of interest has hitherto been charged, and that the revenue of the port from fishing and other vessels has fallen off very considerably within the past few years, and that the Town and Harbour Commissioners have made every effort to meet the heavy instalments?

SIR JOHN GORST: The sum of £11,059 15s. 1d. represents the principal sum, with interest accrued at the rate of 5 per cent., which was still out-

*Mr. Flynn*

standing at the date of the award. The facts are substantially as stated in the second paragraph, except that I have not seen proof of the inability of the ratepayers of the town to meet the special rate of 2s.; but, in view of the steps taken by the Town and Harbour Commissioners, the Treasury are now prepared to grant a reduction of interest from 5 to 4 per cent. as from the date of the award. I see no ground for making any remission of principal.

MR. MORROGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of reducing the interest from the date of the accumulation of the arrears?

SIR JOHN GORST: I cannot go further than to say that we will reduce the interest from the date of the award.

#### TENDERS FOR SCOTCH CONTRACTS.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in the tenders for the pier at Carloway, and for other works under "The Western Highlands Works Act, 1891," Her Majesty's Government will take care that no conditions are inserted similar to those in the tenders for Uig Pier, whereby Scottish contractors are bound to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the English and not the Scottish Courts of Law?

SIR JOHN GORST: The Carloway pier will be constructed under Provisional Order, not under the Act referred to. The contracts are matters for the sole consideration of the promoters and the contractors; but the Secretary for Scotland will, I am informed, do all in his power to secure the omission from the tenders of the conditions complained of by the hon. Member.

MR. BUCHANAN: May I point out to the right hon. Gentleman that it is within the knowledge of Her Majesty's Government that, owing to the conditions imposed under this contract, several contractors withdrew?

SIR JOHN GORST: Well, Sir, I was not aware of that.

#### SCIENCE AND ART EXAMINATIONS.

MR. HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he is aware that Saturday 30th April is the day fixed by the Education Department for the next literary examination of pupils.

teachers in elementary schools, and that the same day has been fixed by the Science and Art Department for the next examination in geometry, and that the result of such an arrangement is to cause general inconvenience and annoyance to pupil teachers, and to prevent many of those who have to sit at different centres for the two subjects from passing both examinations; whether the literary examination is compulsory for pupil teachers, while geometry is taken up almost universally by them; and whether, in view of the great hardship that will result to many teachers if both examinations are held on the same day, he will arrange with one of the Departments to alter their date?

**SIR WILLIAM HART DYKE :** I am much obliged to my hon. Friend for calling attention to this matter, and I am glad to inform him that steps are being taken to hold the Education Departments Examination on an earlier day.

#### TRAWLING IN IRISH WATERS.

**COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.):** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in how many and in what bays in Ireland is trawling forbidden, also in what bays is steam trawling forbidden; if when a large majority of the fishermen residing near any bay desire that trawling should be prohibited, do the Irish Authorities consider and give effect to this desire; has he any evidence to show whether the fishermen near any bay consider that the non-prohibition of trawling has injured the take of fish; if he knows that trawling is forbidden within the three mile limit of Scotland; and if the Irish Government will take steps to ascertain whether the Irish fishermen prefer the Scotch or Irish practice with regard to trawling; and if they prefer the Scotch, will he remove the jurisdiction with regard to trawling from the Irish Fishery Board and transfer it directly to the Lord Lieutenant?

The hon. and gallant Gentleman also had the following question on the Paper: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has made inquiries, and can explain to the House how it was that Question No. 23 on the Paper of Friday was not brought to his attention?

**MR. JACKSON :** I regret I was unable to reply to the last question when it appeared on the Paper on Friday, as I had not then had time to consider the telegraphed Report. As regards the first question, as the answer is somewhat long, perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to give the substance of it.

**COLONEL NOLAN :** The matter is very important, and I should like to have the answer in full.

**MR. JACKSON :** Very well, Sir; I will answer this question in full. The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries report that trawling from sail and steam vessels is prohibited in Belfast Lough, Dundrum Bay, and thence along the coast of Ireland to Howth and in Dublin Bay. Off the coast of Wexford trawlers must keep three miles away from vessels engaged in mackerel or herring fishing. Within certain limits in Waterford Harbour trawling is prohibited as regards vessels of over ten tons. Bantry Bay is closed to trawlers during night time, and within a certain portion of the bay at all times. It is prohibited within certain limits in Brandon Bay. In Galway Bay trawling is not allowed while drift nets are being used for mackerel or herrings. Within certain limits in Inver Bay (County Donegal) it is also prohibited. Trawling from steam vessels is prohibited within certain limits in Sheephaven Bay, off the coasts of Donegal, Londonderry, and Antrim, a portion of the coast of Wexford, a portion of Waterford Harbour, and Lackan Bay. In Killala Bay within certain limits it is prohibited from the 1st of August in each year until the 1st of May in the year following, and in the entire bay at all times when mackerel or herring fishing is being carried on. A bye-law prohibiting steam trawling in Galway Bay inside the Arran Islands has been submitted for the approval of the Lord Lieutenant in Council. Where a large majority of fishermen residing near a bay intimate their desire that trawling should be prohibited therein the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries usually hold a public inquiry into the matter, and, if they consider it desirable, make a bye-law to suit the circumstances of the case. In one case an application from certain fishermen was received requesting that trawling from sailing vessels be prohibited in a bay, but the Inspectors having recently held an inquiry into the fisheries of that bay, and having passed

a bye-law prohibiting steam trawling therein, did not consider it necessary to hold a further inquiry, as they were of opinion that the protection of the bay from steam trawlers was sufficient. Evidence has been given to show that the fishermen near the bay consider the non-prohibition of trawling as injurious to the take of fish. Hence the bye-laws were made prohibiting trawling as described. The list of bye-laws quoted will show that the Inspectors are anxious to protect the fisheries of the bays; but, at the same time, they are careful to avoid any unnecessary action that would harass the trawling industry, which contributes so largely to the food supply. I have no official knowledge of the matter referred to in the fourth paragraph. The Government are not prepared to propose to remove the jurisdiction from the Irish Fishery Inspectors, in whom it is vested by law.

#### THE TREASON-FELONY PRISONERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether a treason-felony prisoner named Gallagher has been released; and, if so, when and on what grounds; whether the treason-felony prisoner McCabe, who became insane, has been discharged; and, if so, when and on what grounds; if not, where is he; and whether he has seen a statement in the Press that a man named Gallagher, a discharged treason-felony prisoner, is now a dangerous lunatic in America?

MR. MATTHEWS: The only treason-felony prisoner named Gallagher is still undergoing his sentence in Portland Prison. I have not seen the statement in the Press to which the hon. Member alludes. McCabe died in Perth Lunatic Asylum on the 9th October, 1890.

MR. P. O'BRIEN: Is it not the fact that two brothers of the name of Gallagher were convicted together, and that one has been released?

MR. MATTHEWS: All I can say is that we have not had more than one treason-felony prisoner of the name of Gallagher.

#### IRISH GRAND JURY ACT.

MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether there is any, and what, provision in the present Grand Jury Act by which

*Mr. Jackson*

a traverse can be tried in any county other than the county concerned; and whether he is aware of any demand on behalf of people living in the North or South of Ireland to have such traverses tried in Dublin, as is proposed by the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Clause 9?

\*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. MADDEN, Dublin University): The latter portion of the answer given by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the previous question of the hon. Member will apply to a considerable extent to the second part of this question. But with reference to the first paragraph, I may point out that there is at present no need of any such provision, inasmuch as presentments are made by Grand Juries at the Assizes at which traverses may be heard before the Judge.

#### MILITARY LEAVE FROM INDIA.

MR. WEBB (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War for what reasons, and upon what terms and conditions as to pay and promotion, are soldiers and non-commissioned officers during service in India allowed home on leave?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: Any warrant or non-commissioned officer after eight years' service abroad, and within the limit of 100 in one season, any soldier down to the rank of bombardier, after five years' continuous service in India, who has re-engaged, may have furlough for six months, with free passage, without loss of pay or promotion.

#### SUNDAY AND NIGHT DUTY AT THE DUBLIN GENERAL POST OFFICE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the hall porters and labourers employed in the General Post Office, Dublin, are required to perform Sunday duty and night duty, for which they are not allowed the usual overtime wage of the Department; whether he is aware that his predecessor in office promised to remedy the grievance of these servants twelve months ago, and that nothing has yet been done for them; and whether he will see that the usual wages are paid, and the deficit of the past twelve months allowed?

**SIR J. FERGUSSON:** The persons in question do as part of their weekly work an average of about two hours on a Sunday. I find that my predecessor said on the 7th March last year that the case of Post Office servants other than sorting clerks and telegraphists was under consideration. Since then extra Sunday pay has been extended to postmen at a considerable cost. I will now consider the cases mentioned, but I am not in a position to make any promises regarding them.

#### EVICTED TENANTS AND THE LAND PURCHASE ACT.

**MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any evicted tenants, or association on the part of evicted tenants, sought to take advantage of Section 13 of the Land Purchase Act of last Session before its expiration, and were unable to do so owing to the refusal of their landlords to co-operate; whether he can give the number of such tenants, the names of their landlords, and the grounds of their refusal to avail themselves of this Act to restore these evicted tenants to their late holdings; and whether the Government intend to introduce or favour any legislation for this object?

**MR. JACKSON:** I have no means of knowing the number of cases in which landlords and former tenants failed to agree to take advantage of the provisions referred to of the Land Purchase Act of last Session. I am not aware of any intention on the part of the Government to propose or to suggest legislation of the compulsory nature indicated in the last paragraph.

#### HOURS OF LABOUR OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN FRANCE.

**MR. MACLEAN (Oldham):** I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the French Legislature has yet passed any law to give effect to the resolutions of the International Conference of Berlin regarding the hours of labour of women and children?

**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith):** The French Legislature has not yet passed into law the Bill relating

to the hours of labour of women and children, but it is in the Orders of the Day for future consideration.

#### METRE GAUGE RAILWAYS IN INDIA

**MR. MACLEAN:** I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the metre gauge railways of Rajputana, the North West Provinces, and Bengal, with a total length exceeding 3,800 miles, which are now divided into four separate and unconnected groups, could all be coupled together for about £400,000, or only two per cent. on the original capital outlay of 20 millions sterling; whether the Secretary of State is aware that the money can easily be found for constructing the missing links of this system, and thus establishing unbroken connection on the metre gauge lines, on which traffic can now only be carried on by repeated transfers from the vehicles of one gauge to those of another, from the Valley of Brahmaputra in the east, across the whole breadth of Northern India to the western seaboard; and whether the India Office proposes to sanction the short connections required to develop the full usefulness of these metre gauge railways?

**MR. CURZON:** The question of constructing these metre gauge lines is now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council, who is therefore unable, at the present moment, to make any public statement as to the cost of construction or the means of raising the money.

#### RULES FOR RETIREMENT IN THE ARMY AND MILITIA.

**MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.):** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a sergeant-major is, under the Royal Warrant, compulsorily retired at 45 if serving with his regiment, and at 50 if with the dépôt; whether, under the Militia Regulations, a sergeant of the permanent staff must retire at 50, unless he was so serving prior to July 1881, while for sergeants of the Regular Army there is no such limit, and men are actually serving with the Regulars who would on the score of age be retired if they belonged to the Militia; and whether he proposes to remove the grievance complained of?



\*MR. E. STANHOPE: The rules for retirement of warrant officers and for the permanent staff of the Militia are as stated in the question. They are necessary for efficiency. There is no age fixed for the compulsory retirement of non-commissioned officers in the Army, but commanding officers take care not to retain men who are no longer efficient. In the last annual Return, out of 13,203 sergeants only 29 were over the age of 50, and 17 of these were in the Royal Artillery, for the most part master gunners. I am not aware that any grievance exists.

#### THE HENRY BARREL COMPANY.

CAPTAIN BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the Government sold the machinery to the Henry Barrel Company for the purpose of manufacturing the order for 30,000 carbines, and for what sum; and what was the original cost of the machinery?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: No, Sir; the machinery in question was not sold to the Henry Company for the purpose indicated in the question. Early in 1889 we sold to the company for £2,000 certain machinery, fixings, &c., which had been used in making the component parts of Martini-Henry rifles. It had been in use for many years and fetched its full value. As the Martini-Henry rifles would be in use for some time to come, it was considered to be an advantage that there should be a company able to make the spare parts, but it was intimated to them at the time of the sale that no orders of any kind could be guaranteed to them. I cannot state the original cost of the machinery.

#### "ACTING" AND "OUTDOOR" CUSTOMS OFFICERS.

MR. NEVILLE (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it was intended by the Treasury Minute of the 24th March, 1891, that the employment of "Acting" Officers should be limited to cases of exceptional pressure or emergency in regard to Customs Officers generally or to Outdoor officers only?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The whole of the Treasury Minute in question relates only to Outdoor officers.

#### LORD WANTAGE'S COMMITTEE.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN (Durham, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, with a view to the House being able to form a judgment on the recommendations of Lord Wantage's Committee, and on the very conflicting opinions advanced by the minority, he will lay upon the Table the whole of the evidence taken before that Committee; and, if so, when he expects to be able to do so?

\*MR. E. STANHOPE: I can only refer to the replies I have already given on this subject, and say that directly I receive the evidence taken by Lord Wantage's Committee, I will consider whether I can lay it upon the Table. I have already stated that it is my wish to present it.

#### REUTER'S TELEGRAM COMPANY.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury why, in the contract between the Controller of the Stationery Office and Reuter's Telegram Company of 21st December, 1891, no provision is made for carrying out the terms of the Resolution of the House of Commons of 13th February, 1891, in regard to the payment by the contractor of a fair rate of wages to the men he employs under the contract?

SIR J. GORST: Before the tender of Reuter's Telegram Company for reporting the Parliamentary Debates was accepted, the attention of the Company was drawn by the Controller of the Stationery Office to the terms of the Resolution adopted by the House of Commons on 13th February, 1891, and an assurance was received that the spirit of the Resolution would be complied with. The Government has no reason to doubt that the assurance so given is being duly carried out.

MR. S. BUXTON: May I ask why this Resolution was not inserted in the contract, in order to make it perfectly clear to the public?

SIR J. GORST: The reasons against such a course were explained last year in the Debate on the Motion brought forward by the hon. Member himself. It is not expedient to insert the Resolution as a condition of a contract, as was then stated.

### THE STEAMER "SIR WALTER RALEIGH."

**MR. DEASY** (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the steamer *Sir Walter Raleigh* put into Bantry Bay recently with her propeller disabled; whether the Board of Trade permitted her to be taken in tow for Dunkirk without having undergone repairs; whether he is aware that she broke adrift from the tug engaged in towing her; that Her Majesty's ships *Triumph* and *Shannon* were despatched to rescue her; and that she was picked up by another steamer, and towed back to Bantry Bay before the Government war vessels reached her; and, if so, whether, in view of the danger to the crew involved in the steamer being towed across the Channel in her present helpless condition, the Board of Trade will direct the necessary repairs to be executed at the nearest dockyard; and if he is aware that the Royal Victoria Dockyard, Cork Harbour, affords ample facilities for the repair of sailing vessels and steamers?

**SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH**: I am informed that this steamer did put into Bantry Bay recently, disabled, as stated in the question. There is no Board of Trade surveyor stationed there, but the coastguard officers reported by telegram to the officer at Dublin that the hull of the steamer was seaworthy; and they did not think any further action necessary, as she was being towed by a powerful tug. I am also informed that she broke adrift from the tug, and eventually returned to Bantry Bay, where she was surveyed by a Board of Trade surveyor despatched from Cork for the purpose. He reports that he found her hull seaworthy. I have directed the surveyor to allow her to leave Bantry with sufficient tug power, on an undertaking being given that she will proceed to the nearest convenient port for repairs to her machinery.

### CHARGE FOR BIRTH CERTIFICATE.

**MR. FLYNN** (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the charge of 3s. 7d. for birth certificate which must be paid by pupils entering for the intermediate examination in Ireland, whether the Irish Office has yet

made any communication to the registrars with a view to reduce the charge to a nominal sum?

**MR. JACKSON**: The fee referred to is a statutable one, and there is, therefore, no power to suggest its reduction.

### THE DEATH OF P. W. NALLY.

**MR. M'CARTAN** (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the death of P. W. Nally, in Mountjoy Gaol, whether he will have a copy of the evidence and verdict given at the coroner's inquest laid upon the Table of the House; and whether Dr. Nally, brother of the deceased, was obliged to leave the gaol at 10 o'clock on the night when his brother was dying there?

**\*MR. JACKSON**: The Government are not aware of any authentic report of the proceedings at the inquest in the case of P. W. Nally. Dr. Nally was not obliged to leave the prison when his brother was dying. On the contrary, as stated in reply to a previous question, Dr. Nally, with other friends, was present at his brother's death, which occurred about 9.50 p.m.

**MR. SEXTON**: Is the right hon Gentleman not aware that the coroner at the inquest was bound to take a copy of the depositions made before him? Are we to have them, or is it intended to conceal from the Members of this House all information as to the death of this man?

**\*MR. JACKSON**: I have answered the question in accordance with the information given to me. So far as I am able to ascertain, the Irish Government have no authentic report of the proceedings at the inquest; but if there is an authentic report of course I will make inquiry about it.

**MR. SEXTON**: I will ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether it is not the practice of a coroner to take a copy of the evidence given before him; and whether the Irish Government will inquire if it was not done in this case?

**MR. MADDEN**: Undoubtedly it is usual for a coroner to take the depositions, but I am not aware whether it was done in the present case.

### POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN TIPPERARY.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he has received a memorial from a large number of resident householders in the parishes of Upperchurch and Drumbane, County Tipperary, representing a population of nearly 3,000 inhabitants, praying that they would be afforded the accommodation of a Sunday post at the village of Upperchurch; whether he is aware of the great inconvenience the residents in this locality are subject to (some of them persons in business, clergymen, and others) owing to there being no postal delivery on Sundays; and whether the want could be supplied at a trifling cost by the appointment of a rural messenger on the Sundays from Ballycahill to Upperchurch, the distance being only five miles; and, if so, will steps be taken to have this public want supplied?

SIR J. FERGUSSON: Such a memorial has been received, but it has not been found practicable to comply with its prayer because of the expense involved. Even the existing service entails considerable loss on the Revenue.

### FAIR RENT APPEALS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the landlords in the union of Dunmanway who have had fair rents fixed before the Sub-Commissioners are pressing their tenants for the old rents without allowing them the reductions granted by the Sub-Commissioners, he will expedite the hearing of appeals in the union referred to by the Chief Land Commissioners?

MR. JACKSON: I have no information on the subject-matter of this question; but I would remind the hon. Member that there is statutable provision for an adjustment between landlord and tenant in respect to payments made in regard to altered rents.

MR. GILHOOLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman ascertain when the Land Commissioners will hear the appeals?

MR. JACKSON: I am sure the Land Commission would desire to expedite the proceedings as much as possible.

MR. GILHOOLY: In the meantime, allow me to say, the landlords are pressing for the old rents which the tenants are unable to pay.

MR. JACKSON: I have no power to interfere; but the Court to which application is made will have power to take into consideration all circumstances of that kind.

### PUBLIC MEETINGS IN IRELAND.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that at a recent public meeting held at Goleen, Captain Welch, R.M., had a number of policemen, armed with rifles and bâtons, drawn up close and in view of the meeting, and threatened that if any illegal language was made use of he would disperse the meeting by force; and what Statute, if any, empowered Captain Welch to disperse the meeting?

MR. JACKSON: The facts appear to be as follows. From what had occurred at a meeting held at Goleen a few days previously, Captain Welch had reason to believe that the meeting referred to would be used for the promotion of intimidation, in relation to certain evictions which were being carried on in the immediate neighbourhood. Before the commencement of the meeting he spoke publicly to Father Forrest, P.P., pointing out the illegality of such a course, and warning him that if the meeting proved to be an unlawful assembly it would be his duty to disperse it.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I should like to ask the Attorney General to explain under what Law or Statute this proceeding was taken. I should like at the same time to ask him to extend his answer so as to cover a case in which a similar proceeding was taken against myself when I endeavoured to address my constituents in a peaceable district. I want to know under what Statute a magistrate was justified in approaching me on the platform, and saying to me—

"Mr. Dillon, if you use any language which, in my judgment, is illegal, I shall break up this meeting."

MR. MADDEN: I cannot answer, of course, for what occurred in the case referred to by the hon. Member. He asks me under what Law or Statute a meeting, assuming it to be called for the purpose of intimidation, was dispersed.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman has missed the point of my

question. I was told this was a legal meeting, and that I could hold it, but that if my language in the judgment of the magistrate was improper or illegal the meeting would be dispersed.

MR. MADDEN: I assumed that the question put across the Table had reference to the facts of the case brought before me by the question on the Paper, but, if the hon. Gentleman wishes for information about other meetings, I must ask him to give me notice.

MR. GILHOOLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at the previous meeting referred to there was a police reporter in attendance? If it was illegal, why not bring a prosecution; but why should a Magistrate be judge and jury in the case?

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN: Has Captain Welch had any legal training whatever?

MR. MADDEN: I am not aware that the legal training of Captain Welch has anything to do with the matter.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman is evidently declining to answer the question I have put to him. It is whether it is legal for an Irish Magistrate to set himself up on the spot as a judge of the language of the speakers, and, if so, under what Law it is done? Mr. Speaker, I must ask the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the point of my question. If the meeting was illegal, why was it allowed to be held at all? It was allowed to be held, and that is a proof that in the opinion of the Magistrate it was not illegal, and the question is under what Law or Statute the Magistrate was entitled to constitute himself on the spot a judge, not only as to whether the meeting was illegal or not, but also whether the language used by the speakers was illegal?

MR. MADDEN: The Magistrate could not constitute himself a judge of the legality of the language used at the meeting. But, if the hon. Gentleman wishes to go into the question of other meetings, I must request him to give me notice. In regard to the particular meeting to which the question on the Paper relates, Captain Welch, rightly or wrongly—I cannot go into that—after what occurred at a previous meeting was apprehensive that the meeting about to be held would be used for the purpose of intimidation. Now, if the meeting had been so used, it would have been an unlawful assembly, and it would have been

his duty to disperse it. The hon. Gentleman asks me if it was legal for Captain Welch to speak to gentlemen present at the meeting; but, in stating his apprehension and warning them of the possible consequences, he was doing nothing illegal.

MR. DILLON: The point of the question is that he stated that he would disperse the meeting if illegal language was used, and that amounts to saying that he would be the judge of the legality of such language.

MR. MADDEN: The hon. Gentleman will allow me to complete my answer. That is, no doubt, a point in the question, but what I said in reply is a totally different thing—that Captain Welch, in stating that if the meeting was used for the purposes of intimidation it would be an unlawful assembly, and it would be his duty to disperse it, was acting perfectly within the law.

#### COMMUNICATION BETWEEN WHITE-GATE AND WOODFORD.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he can now state when telegraph communication can be established between Whitegate and Woodford; whether he is aware that letters at present take two days to go from one town to the other, though the distance is only six miles; and what steps he intends taking to redress this grievance?

SIR J. FERGUSSON: I have already explained that the circumstances would not admit of direct postal communication being established between the two places named. It is true that the letters take two days in passing from one to the other, but they are very few in number. With reference to the telegraph: on a similar question being asked last week the necessary inquiries were directed, but there has not yet been time to receive the Report.

#### MAIL TRAIN SERVICE TO WEXFORD.

MR. SEXTON (on behalf of Mr. T. M. HEALY, Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he proposes to take any, and what, steps to carry out the promise of the late Postmaster General to grant a faster mail train service to Wexford?

SIR J. FERGUSSON: I am not informed that the late Postmaster General promised to grant a faster mail

train service to Wexford. He promised to endeavour to come to terms with the Railway Company for that purpose, but the extra payment which they would require is more than the Service can afford. So far as the Post Office itself is concerned, all that is possible has been done by sorting on the way, and by the employment of additional force to expedite the delivery of the letters at Wexford, as well as at Enniscorthy.

#### INSTRUCTION IN ARBORICULTURE.

MR. HAYDEN (on behalf of Mr. HARRISON, Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the authorities in Ireland, following the precedent set by the Board of Agriculture in England, have taken any steps to provide for suitable instruction in the higher and lower branches of arboriculture and silviculture, as advised by the Select Committee on Forestry in 1887?

MR. JACKSON: I have called for, but not yet received, Reports on this question. I must therefore ask the hon. Member to be good enough to defer it.

#### TREE-PLANTING IN IRELAND.

MR. HAYDEN (for Mr. HARRISON): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in how many cases and to what extent the Congested Districts Board has availed itself of its power to undertake the re-forestation of waste lands in Ireland; and whether he will use his influence to urge upon the Board the great importance of tree-planting in Ireland, and the yearly increasing likelihood of its proving remunerative in the near future?

MR. JACKSON: The Congested Districts Board have taken over from the Land Commission the carrying out of the forestry operations at Knockboy, County Galway. The lands being dealt with comprise 914 statute acres. This is the only case up to the present in which the Congested Districts Board have availed themselves of their powers to develop forestry in Ireland, but a proposal to purchase additional land is at present under consideration.

MR. HAYDEN (on behalf of Mr. HARRISON): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what advances have been by the Board of Works, under Clause 20 of the Tramways and Public Companies (Ire-

*Sir J. Fergusson*

land) Act, which included the planting of trees amongst the objects to which, with the sanction of the Treasury, the Board of Works was authorised to make advances under the 31st section of the Land Law (Ireland) Act of 1881?

SIR J. GORST: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer that question, and to say that no advances have been made.

#### AN INSANE CONVICT.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that a convict named Clarke, late Postmaster and Churchwarden at Bringham, Norfolk, now confined in Portland Prison, has become insane; and whether he will consider his case with a view to his release?

MR. MATTHEWS: A prisoner named Clarke has become insane, and is now at Broadmoor. I am informed that there is no ground whatever for the suggestion that his insanity is due to prison treatment. The medical officer reports that it was probably congenital. During the time he was in a convict prison he never made a complaint to the authorities, nor did he send any petition to the Home Office.

#### ENNISKILLEN GAOL.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Prisons Board claim the area in front of the gaol in Enniskillen, extending from the gaol wall to the channel adjoining the county road leading south to Castlecoole; and, if so, is it the duty of the Board to keep it in proper repair and clean it; will they either do so, or hand it over to the Local Authority, the Town Commissioners, to put it into and keep it in proper condition; and is this gaol being now used as a prison, or is it intended that the authorities will discontinue its use as such, and permit it to fall into further dilapidation; if not, will they instruct an engineer to inspect and report on the condition and appearance of the outside front wall, doors, &c., with a view to due repairs?

MR. JACKSON: I am causing inquiries to be made in regard to the subject of this question, but have not yet received the information.

## RENTS IN ENNISKILLEN.

**MR. JORDAN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that rents in many cases and generally were increased by the Land Commissioners in Enniskillen, county Fermanagh, last week; and if he will state the number of cases in which rents were thus increased, and the number in which they were reduced, at those sittings; and the number of appeals by the landlord and tenant respectively, both in the cases of increased and reduced rents?

**MR. JACKSON:** I am informed that at the recent sitting of the Land Commissioners' Court of Appeal at Enniskillen 82 cases were heard. They included 55 landlords' appeals, of which 28 were raised and 27 confirmed. Of the six cross appeals, one was raised and five were confirmed. Of the 20 tenants' appeals, 12 were confirmed and eight reduced.

## DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT.

**MR. JORDAN** (on behalf of Mr. CHANCE, Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether the provisions of "The Deeds of Arrangement (Amendment) Act, 1890," so far as relate to private arrangements, and especially Sub-section 5, of Section 2, have been disregarded; and what steps the Government proposes to take to ensure the observance of the Act?

**MR. MADDEN:** I have made inquiries into this matter. I find that a difficulty has arisen in carrying out the provisions of the Act, especially having regard to the enactments of the sub-section referred to in the question. The matter is too technical to be explained in reply to a question. But I have given the matter careful consideration, and I believe that the difficulty is capable of being removed.

## PAYMENT OF RATES AS BETWEEN LANDLORD AND TENANT.

**MR. KNOX** (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether with reference to the provision in Clause 2, Sub-section (2) (a) of the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, by which (notwithstanding any contract by the owner, whether in town or country, to pay the county cess or borough rate,

or any part thereof) the whole of any increase beyond the present amount of the cess or rate is to be paid by the occupier only, the Government are prepared to introduce a Bill regulating the contracts between landlord and tenant concerning the payment of rates in every part of the United Kingdom?

**THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY** (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I must remind the hon. Member that the main outlines of our programme are now before the House, and I am afraid I cannot undertake to make any addition to it.

## CARLOWAY PIER.

**DR. MACDONALD** (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received tenders for the construction of the pier at Carloway, in the Island of Lewis, some months ago, and how soon is he likely to decide to proceed with the work; and whether, in reference to the construction of the road from Stornoway to Carloway, effect is to be given to the unanimous decision of the district committee of the County Council as to the manner of its construction?

**SIR J. GORST:** My right hon. Friend has asked me to reply to this question. Tenders for the construction of the pier were submitted in December, and are now under the consideration of the promoters. In accordance with the usual rule the works cannot be commenced until the Provisional Order for their execution has received the sanction of Parliament, but every effort will be made to expedite the passing of the confirming Bill. As regards the road from Stornoway to Carloway the Secretary for Scotland has been in communication with the County Council, with the result that there is now practically an agreement as to the method of construction, and it only remains to settle the question how far a portion of the present road near Stornoway may be utilised.

## THE YEOMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD.

**MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is intended to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the death of Sir Spencer Clifford to combine the duties of Yeoman Usher of

the Black Rod and of Secretary to the Lord Great Chamberlain, as recommended by the House of Lords Committee of 8th August, 1889, with a view to effect a saving of £700 per annum?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As the hon. Gentleman is aware, the matter is not within the competence of the Government, but it is entirely within that of the House of Lords itself, and I am given to understand that their Lordships desire to carry out, as soon as possible, the intention expressed by the Committee to which the question refers.

#### PENSIONS AND SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES.

MR. FRANCIS STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would object to a Motion for a Return showing the total amount of the Exchequer issues in the year ending 31st March, 1891, in respect of pensions and superannuation allowances, indicating the total amount charged for the purpose on the Consolidated Fund; and the total amount issued for the purpose on account of Naval Services, Military Services, Civil Services, Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, and Post Office Services; and whether he would object to the inclusion in the Return of the total amount paid out of the local taxation account in respect of police superannuation, and of the total amount expended by Local Authorities during the year upon pensions and superannuation allowances?

MR. GOSCHEN: The information for which the hon. Member asks in the first part of his question is contained in the Report of the Appropriation Account, so that there would be no need of a Return. With regard to the information sought for in the second part of the question, I must refer him to my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board.

#### FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

SIR EDWARD BIRKBECK (Norfolk): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture a question, of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether his attention has been called to statements in the *Observer* with regard to the action taken by the Board of Agriculture in reference to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease?

*Mr. Labouchere*

SIR WALTER BARTTELOT (N.W.): I also wish to ask whether right hon. Gentleman has heard outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease at Edinburgh, and also at Ashurst, Sussex?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. C. Lincolnshire, Sleaford): In reply to hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Barttelot), I regret to say that I received notice on Saturday of an outbreak having occurred at Edinburgh. I have inquired into the circumstances of the case; but the reports I have received to the present time do not enable me to trace the origin of the outbreak. If also true, I am sorry to say, that the outbreak which occurred in Sussex some days ago appears to have extended to a farm there, and to a neighbouring farm called the Bentley. In reply to the question of my right hon. Friend behind me (Sir Edward Birkbeck), I have to say that my attention has been called to various statements which recently appeared in the paper relating to, to the effect that we are relaxing precautions in connection with the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and have treated the matter with levity, reflecting severely on the conduct of the Board of Agriculture generally. I think there is no foundation for these statements, and I can only suppose that they are based upon a complete misapprehension as to the effect of some of the most important orders of the Board and the circumstances under which they have been passed. It is true we have re-opened the London Market and revoked the orders for prohibiting the movement of animals alive from the market, for this reason, London must be fed, and if those orders were continued animals would be kept at railway stations, in yards, at public houses, and other places over which we should and could have no control. We have therefore thought it necessary to re-open the market, leaving the animals free to be taken from the market to any destination within the County of London, but taking the most stringent precautions in which we are being most ably assisted by the police, to prevent any animal from the market going beyond the limits of the County of London. In effect, I hope, will be this: that animals will go freely into the market, and unhappily the disease should be brought in.

into it again we shall have them altogether under our control and be able to deal with it at once.

**SIR U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH:** I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, with respect to the outbreak at Edinburgh, whether he can inform the House if he has any reason to suppose it is connected with cases which have arisen in London, or whether it is an independent outbreak?

**MR. CHAPLIN:** As far as I have been able to ascertain up to the present time the outbreak in Edinburgh is regarded as quite independent of that which took place in London; but as the right hon. Gentleman knows very well, it is quite possible that the disease may have been conveyed from London to Edinburgh without there being any indication of it.

#### MEETINGS AT WORLD'S END, CHELSEA.

**MR. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.):** I beg to ask the Home Secretary whether his attention has been called to the fact that a meeting which was being held at World's End, Chelsea, on Sunday was suddenly attacked and broken up by the police without any warning being given to the speakers, and notwithstanding his answer on the 23rd instant to a deputation that such meetings would not be interfered with?

**MR. WHITMORE:** I would also, before the right hon. Gentleman answers that question, ask whether it is not the fact the meeting that day was disorderly and obstructed the traffic; and whether the police did not interfere with it until the disorder and obstruction caused by it compelled them to do so?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** What I said to the deputation on the 23rd instant was that if we think the meetings at the World's End were of the same character as those which preceded August last, and were accompanied by no disturbance of the peace and no obstruction to the public thoroughfare, the police would not interfere; but I added that the police would be neglecting their first duty if they did not interfere with such meetings as had taken place there since September last. I am informed that yesterday the police had orders to avoid interference with the meeting if possible, and an Assistant Commissioner attended in person to enforce these orders. The

police were not sent for, and did not interfere at all until the number of persons assembled had so largely increased that the thoroughfares were blocked and there were much noise and disturbance. The Inspector then requested the speaker to desist, calling his attention to the obstruction and disturbance, and informing him that there was illness in several neighbouring houses. The speaker refused to desist, and the policemen then caused the central group to move on and cleared the roadway. I am informed that inhabitants in the neighbourhood were for some time prevented from leaving their houses, and that a clergyman, whose mission room is at World's End, was unable to get there.

#### COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS.

**MR. LABOUCHERE:** In the absence of the President of the Local Government Board, I wish to ask the Home Secretary what law there is that justifies a Deputy Returning Officer counting votes at a County Council Election at his office instead of at the polling place, as is now being done at one of the divisions of Norfolk?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** I must ask the hon. Gentleman for notice of that question.

**MR. LABOUCHERE:** But it is going on now.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

##### THE SCOTCH EQUIVALENT GRANT.

**MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs):** I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will undertake not to take to-night Vote 4, Class 7, of the Supplementary Estimates, relating to local taxation (Scotland), the reason being that it is so obviously mixed up with the subject of the Bill he proposes to bring in that we could hardly vote the money until we have seen that measure?

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR:** I do not see that the connection which the right hon. Gentleman speaks of exists, at all events, to the extent he thinks it does; but I hope hon. Gentlemen opposite will allow us to bring in our Bill as soon as we can, and that the right hon. Gentleman will do his best to facilitate the proceedings so that the Bill may be printed as soon as possible. I cannot give an absolute



promise that we will not take the Vote to-night, but I think it is improbable that it will be reached.

**MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN :** It will be very inconvenient to many of us to be obliged to wait for the chance of its coming on; but, if the right hon. Gentleman would say it will not be taken, we need not do so.

**MR. BALFOUR :** The fact of the matter is that the House itself will be greatly inconvenienced unless we can get through the Supplementary Estimates in the course of this week. As the right hon. Gentleman knows, we have only Monday and Thursday in which to do so, and if the financial business is postponed it will be necessary for the Government to ask for the time of private Members at a much earlier date than they would otherwise desire to do; but on that condition I should have no objection to acceding to the request of the right hon. Gentleman.

#### THE GRESHAM CHARTER.

**MR. MUNDELLA** (Sheffield, Brightside): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, for the convenience of the House generally, whether he will afford sufficient time for the discussion of the Gresham Charter, because the stoppage of other business one hour before the usual time would not afford adequate opportunity for debate?

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR :** Well, Sir, as the right hon. Gentleman is aware, a question was put to me by an hon. Friend of my own on this side of the House upon the subject a few nights ago, and I then pointed out to the House that this was not a discussion which would be, or could be, brought to a premature conclusion under the Twelve o'Clock Rule; and that, therefore, although it might involve our sitting an hour or two later and might be inconvenient, yet the discussion would reach its full term. I have every desire to meet the wishes of the House, but I cannot create time, as the right hon. Gentleman knows. We are already hampered for time in consequence of the anxious desire of hon. Gentlemen opposite to discuss our Bills before they are introduced; and we have not been allowed to introduce some of the most important of our measures; I am, therefore, afraid that I cannot at present give the right hon. Gentleman the promise for which he asks.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

#### THE DIPLOMATIC VOTE.

**MR. MORTON :** May I ask Lord of the Treasury whether he will go on with the Diplomatic Vote Supplementary Estimates?

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR :** Yes, Sir, in consequence of the arrangement coming on Friday, that will stand first on next.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICES  
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.  
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.  
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

#### CLASS VI.

Motion made, and Question put.

"That a sum, not exceeding £80,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the charges which will come in course of payment in the year ending on the 31st day of March 1892, as a Grant in Aid of the Capital Pension Fund created under the provisions of the National School Teachers' (Ireland) Act, 1879."

(6.40.) **MR. SEXTON** (Belfast): This, Mr. Courtney, is a Vote of considerable interest, if not to the Members, who are now leaving the House in such numbers, at any rate to the Irish Members. By this Vote it is proposed to take the whole of £80,000 equivalent, for the current year, out of the grant given to England for free education. It is proposed to take the sum of £90,000, and apply it to the National Teachers' Fund. The question of the application of this sum has been lying over since last year, and was frequently mentioned in the later months of last Session. Now, when we are in close proximity to the end of the financial year, we find we are obliged to do with it, not by a Bill, but by a Vote in Supply. I feel obliged to confess that whilst a Vote in Supply is a very convenient mode for dealing with money, when the principle of expenditure has been already affirmed, I can conceive nothing more inconvenient or prejudicial to the privileges, or to the rights of Members, than to present a new proposal, never

or even debated, and perhaps to carry it into effect by procedure in Supply. If it were a Bill, we would have an opportunity of proposing useful Amendments which might have a chance of acceptance; but under this procedure, if we think the sum is not enough for the purpose we cannot move to increase it, and we cannot reduce it if it were thought that the amount was needlessly large. Again, Sir, it will not be denied that the information on the face of this Estimate is of the most meagre possible kind. There is a foot note in which we are told something which we know already, and upon which we do not require to be informed. We are told where the money comes from. Members are well aware that this money is 9 per cent.—Ireland's share—of the Free Education grant. But upon what we do require to know we receive no information. We are not told what circumstances have arisen to render necessary the appropriation of this great sum to the particular purpose in question. It is only a week ago that the right hon. Gentleman told us that—

"Either the payments into the fund had been too small, or the payments out of it had been too large."

Now, that might be a description of any fund that had ever been found to be in an unsatisfactory condition. What we want to know is, which is it? Have the payments been smaller than was originally expected; or have the payments out been larger? The right hon. Gentleman has truly said that the fund showed a tendency to get into bad water. Surely we are entitled to more information. Is it in bad water now? It has been suggested that the State is not responsible for the condition of this fund. Why, Sir, this fund was founded by a public Act of Parliament in 1879, and by that Act £1,300,000 was taken out of the Irish Church Surplus Fund, and applied in aid of this very fund now before us. Under that Act an elaborate system was devised. Three-fourths of the teachers' premiums were to be paid out of the Church Government subvention; the other fourth was to be supplied by the teachers who joined the fund. Who is it who is responsible for the Vote? If anyone will turn to the Estimates, and look at the Vote for the Treasury and subordinate Departments, he will find that one of the subordinate Departments is the

office of this very Pension Fund. The superintendent of the pension office is a gentleman who receives £200 a year, and who is besides an actuary. So that you have an official actuary recognised in one of the great Departments of State in charge of this pension office in Dublin. It was his duty to see that the fund did not get into backwater, or even into the tendency to get into backwater. He should have warned the Government, and the Government should have warned this House, that the fund was getting into an unsound condition. I see in the Estimates we are told that the receipts of the fund are not in excess of liabilities as declared by the recent valuation. Why did not the recent valuation disclose that? I would suggest we ought to have a copy of the recent valuation; at least, we ought to have the substance of it. I now ask whatever Minister rises to reply, to inform us as to its precise effect. Moreover, when did the deficiency begin to arise? What is the amount of it at the present moment? I particularly wish to know whether, if we agree to apply this £90,000 to the Pension Fund now, we may assure ourselves that the fund will be in a sound position, and that we shall not be told at the end of another five years that the fund shows a tendency to get into backwater, and that some money is to be devoted by the Government to the fund for the purpose of assisting it. I think I am entitled to say that it is hardly treating Irish Members fairly in regard to a matter of finance, when it is only in a speech upon the Debate that the Chief Secretary tells us incidentally what he intends to do. We have received numerous letters from Irish teachers upon the subject. One teacher, writing on the 28th February, said, with reference to the report that the Chief Secretary intended to hand over the £90,000 accruing since September last to the Pension Fund—

"It is not fair, as it was meant that the teachers would charge no school fees. They will be at a loss for the half-year ending 31st March, so that they are entitled to be compensated in lieu of the school fees."

The suggestion here made is that upon the announcement of free education last year some of the teachers ceased collecting school fees—depending upon the establishment of free education. Their income for the present year is

consequently seriously diminished. I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has inquired of the Commissioners of National Education if within the past half year an expectation amongst the people has led to the cessation of school fees; and whether, if so, he has any proposal to meet the case? I do not myself oppose the principle of the allocation of this fund in aid of the Pension Fund, but I submit that as some teachers may have incurred loss, we are entitled to have the most specific information given as to the circumstances of the Pension Fund.

**\*(6.52.) THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY** (Sir JOHN GORST, *Chatham*): I will give the hon. Member the fullest information I possibly can in reply to his questions. The fund was created, as he indicated, by the appropriation of £1,300,000 out of the Irish Church surplus, to which was added a contribution by the teachers themselves. About three-fourths of the fund consists of the Irish Church surplus and accumulations, and about one-fourth consists of the contributions made by the teachers themselves and the accumulations. The whole difficulty has arisen from an unfortunate, and I must say I think a mistaken, actuarial valuation made in the year 1885. That was at the end of the first quinquennial period of the fund. The Report made at that time to the then Government showed that the assets of the fund, on the 31st December, 1884, amounted to £1,664,872 and the liabilities to £1,468,285 only, showing a surplus of assets over liabilities of no less than £196,587. The Government of the day, 1885, had to deal with that surplus. It clearly belonged to the National School teachers of Ireland. It had to be allocated in some way—either by reducing the amount of the subscription, or by increasing the benefits which had been provided by the Act of 1879. The Government of 1885 decided to take the latter course, and they changed the scheme of the Act of 1879 by promising the National School teachers of Ireland certain extra benefits.

**COLONEL NOLAN**: What was the date in 1885?

**\*SIR JOHN GORST**: The hon. Member asks a question which I shall be glad to answer later. This was what was done. In the first

*Mr. Sexton*

place, provision was made for a return to the representatives of a teacher who died, of the premiums which the teacher had paid towards his pension, and which according to the scheme of 1879 would have been lost to the teacher's representatives in case of death; and the cost of this was supposed to amount to £35,000. Then there were the claims of members of certain abolished classes of teachers to somewhat increased pensions to be considered. These claims were admitted, amounting to a capital liability of about £3,500 more. Then there was a rule introduced that male and female teachers should be allowed to retire after 40 years' service upon their maximum pension, reckoned from the age 21 in the case of males, and 18 in the case of females. This concession was calculated to involve a capital liability of about £150,000. Therefore, by these concessions which I have enumerated, nearly the whole estimated surplus of £196,000 was disposed of. The new rules were in operation for another quinquennial period, and then there was another actuarial valuation made. And it turned out, that so far from the fund being then solvent there was a deficit in it.

**An hon. MEMBER**: Was the valuation made by the same actuary?

**\*SIR JOHN GORST**: I believe so. The actuarial valuation brought out in 1891 that the liabilities were £195,000 more than the assets, so that whereas at the end of the first quinquennial period there was a sum of £196,000 to the good, at the end of the second period there was £195,000 to the bad. Of course the merits of highly technical actuarial calculations form a subject upon which Members of the Government, and, I daresay, Representatives from Ireland are not properly qualified to express an opinion. Therefore the Government, with this extraordinary variation between the first and second actuarial valuation, appointed a Committee consisting of three actuaries, one being the actuary who made the first Report—and, I believe, the second Report also—and two being independent actuaries. They are now preparing a Report which has not yet been submitted to the Government. Therefore I am as much in the dark as hon. Members from Ireland are as to how this extraordinary difference between the

first and second valuation arose. But when the investigation is completed Her Majesty's Government will carefully consider the Report, and will see how this important fund can be brought into a condition of solvency.

**MR. T. W. RUSSELL:** They may bring out a surplus.

**\*SIR JOHN GORST:** I do not think that is likely; but, of course, it is possible. However, when this careful valuation is made, the Government will take the matter into their careful consideration to see that such steps are taken as can be taken to put the fund into a condition of solvency. With regard to the dates in 1885, I may explain that the valuation referred to the condition of the fund on the last day of 1884, and it was received in the middle of 1885. I am afraid that the question as to exactly what Government was in Office is rather doubtful. The probability is rather in favour of the last Government but three. I do not commit myself to a positive statement on that matter, but it was not the present Government, and not the last Government but one, but either the last Government but two or the last Government but three. Then there was this sum of £90,000, which was due to Irish education in some form or other as an equivalent to the English free school grant, and it was represented to Her Majesty's Government that it could not be applied to free education in Ireland, because the fees had already been paid for the current year. The Government could not find any object on which it could be spent which seemed more in the interests of Irish education than applying it to this fund and putting it in a condition of solvency. By the rules of 1885, the teachers received greater benefits from the fund without being called upon to subscribe more to secure them. The object of the present proposal is to continue those benefits at the low subscription under the Act of 1879. I am sorry that more time has not been given to the Irish teachers and Members of Parliament to consider the matter. There is a great deal of force in the suggestion that the matter should be dealt with by Bill, but it is necessary that the money should be disposed of before the 31st of March of this year, or it will have to be paid back to the

Consolidated Fund and go towards the reduction of the National Debt. There is, therefore, scarcely time to pass an ordinary Bill on the subject, and I thought hon. Gentlemen from Ireland would accept it in the form of a Supplementary Estimate, which would be equally conducive to their interests.

(7.5.) **COLONEL NOLAN (Louth, N.):** I cannot quite understand the position with regard to this money which belongs to the Irish teachers, and has been simply confiscated by the Treasury. This sum of £90,000 became due last year, and we were told that it was the equivalent to the £500,000 or £600,000 which was the proportion of England. The then Chief Secretary for Ireland said:—

“I have a delightful scheme by which this sum will come into my fund for making my Land Act perfectly secure.”

We Irish Members protested against the money being confiscated in that way, and the disposal of the money was postponed till this year. Now it ought to go to the teachers in some form or other. They may give it in the shape of class salaries, pensions, or capitation grants as they choose; but they are not going to do that. The Government have no right to dispose of this money as they are proposing to do. This fund was started in 1879 with £1,300,000 from the Irish Church surplus and went on well till 1885, and then the Treasury comes forward and says it will increase the benefits to the teachers. I do not know which Government it was, but it is a significant fact that whenever there is a dispute as to Ireland's share of any advantages Ireland always goes to the wall. In 1885 you made us a present of £196,000, and now you want to take it back again, which is the way you always behave towards Ireland. You have no right to give and take in this manner. Last year you told us that Ireland was to get a proportional share of the Grant, and now you are giving us none at all. You are putting the £90,000 into a reserve fund of the Treasury, and the teachers will get no benefit from it. Then what is the cost of administering the Fund?

**MR. JACKSON:** There is no cost of administration.

**COLONEL NOLAN:** In 1885 you pretended to make a gift to Ireland of £196,000; what right have you in 1892 to take this £90,000 to make up that

original sum without the consent of the Irish Members? If I can get any of my hon. Friends to support me I shall be inclined to vote against this £90,000. I do not believe it will be confiscated on the 31st of March. It is confiscated already. The teachers lose it actually either with or without the consent of the Irish Members, and I rather think the latter way is the better of the two.

\*SIR JOHN GORST: In 1885 fresh rules were made under Section 10 of the Act of 1879, which empowers the Treasury, at any time after the passing of the Act, with the consent of the Lord Lieutenant, to make rules from time to time for the administration of the Act. These are the rules which prescribe the amount of benefit to be given to the teachers under the Act. The new rules of 1885 gave the teachers greater benefits, the Treasury being under the impression that the fund was more than solvent. The fund was, however, found to be less than solvent on an actuarial examination in 1891, and it was found that unless something of this sort were done, some capital sum carried to the relief of the fund, teachers entering the service in the future would have less benefits than those at present in the service are receiving. The fund was created out of the Irish Church surplus, and the investment of the fund is prescribed by the Act, so that the Office of the Treasury is purely ministerial in carrying out its provisions. It is only on the fund created by Parliament that the teachers have any claim, and therefore if that fund is insufficient without a subvention of this kind it becomes the duty of the Treasury to make fresh rules which would give less benefits to teachers.

\*(7.15.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): The statement of the Secretary to the Treasury was perfectly clear, but I do not think it will be very satisfactory to Irish Members. The Actuarial Report in 1885 showed a surplus of £195,000, but we are told that the Actuarial Report in 1890 showed a deficit of £190,000, and now there is another Actuarial Committee sitting to inquire into its actual state. Will this £90,000 make the fund solvent? At any rate it will help in that direction, and I must not be taken as objecting to it. I want to point out that we have one precedent for dealing with this fund. Last year

*Colonel Nolan*

the Constabulary Pension Fund was found to be in the same condition—insolvent. But the Government did not take any money of this kind to make it up; the Government made it up themselves. I think the Irish teachers are entitled to this money, and if there be a deficiency in the Fund I do not say that this is not a good way of meeting it. But I should like some explanation from some Member of the Government as to the difference in the treatment of the two Funds.

(7.20.) MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I want to know if there is any precedent in the history of Parliament for calling upon a Committee of this House to vote a large sum of money to make good a deficiency in a fund when nobody knows if there is a deficiency at all? I understood the Secretary to the Treasury to say that the actuary who made the valuation in 1885, and the one in 1890, producing such utterly different results, is one and the same individual. If that be so, no reliance can be placed on the valuation of that gentleman. We are left entirely in the dark as to the deficit, and the Government has appointed a committee of this gentleman and two others to look into the matter. Yet we are asked to vote this £90,000 to make up the deficit while that committee is still sitting, and has not yet reported. The Government has given us no reason for believing in this deficit at all, and it is most unjust to the teachers to take the money and apply it in this way. If the Government had been able to deal with the money when it dealt with the grants to England and Scotland the teachers would now have been in the enjoyment of it; and if the fund had then been found to be insolvent, does anyone doubt for a moment that it would have been held to be the duty of the Government to make up the deficiency which had arisen entirely from their maladministration. The Irish teachers are admittedly the worst paid in the three countries, and that makes it a greater hardship that this money should be disposed of as the Government proposes. Last year the principle on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid it down that this money was to be distributed to the three countries was most unjust. On what ground was it decided that Ireland was only to have 9 per cent. of the total sum? The Govern-

ment proclaims itself Unionist and determined to keep Ireland part of the United Kingdom, but when it comes to distributing money they are Separatists, and set up a totally different principle to guide our finance. The right hon. Gentleman, instead of taking the number of children to be provided for and giving the grant at so much per head on the school attendance, as in the other two countries, asks us to accept from him what are the relative contributions from the three countries to the Imperial funds, which contributions are calculated by him in the dark, and which he gives us no means of checking. We are told over and over again that Ireland is to share to the fullest extent in all the benefits of a division as part and parcel of the United Kingdom. Here, because she is the poorest part of the Kingdom, and, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, only contributes 9 per cent. of the Imperial funds, her school children are to get a very much smaller grant per head than those of the other parts of the Kingdom. I want to know on what ground he justifies that proportion. Scotland is treated far more justly than Ireland is. The principle which underlies the distribution is the principle of separatism in finance. When the question of the distribution of money comes to be considered, the Government are Separatists and not Unionists; they act as Separatists in the matter of finance, and in that only. Instead of giving the grant at a rate per head of the children attending school, as they do in England, they act on the principle of the relative contributions of the three countries, and even then they give us no means of checking the figures. In conclusion, I have only to say that in my judgment the appropriation of this £90,000 to make good a mistake of the actuaries in regard to the Teachers' Pension Fund is a great injustice to the teachers of Ireland. The Government are responsible for the mistake that has been made, and I hold that it is their duty to make good any deficiency out of Imperial funds.

(7.35.) **SIR JOHN GORST** (Chatham): I am anxious that the House should understand how this matter stands. As to the question of the proportion which Ireland ought to have, I admit that it is, upon the whole, a very large question, and I must decline to go into it.

This is not the time when such a matter can be approached. But I wish to state to the House that the figure before the Committee was based upon the very best information which was accessible to the Government, as to the proportion of revenue paid by the three parts of the United Kingdom respectively.

**MR. J. DILLON**: Is it based upon that principle?

**\*SIR JOHN GORST**: It is based upon that principle. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is most anxious to have the matter investigated, and it is not the fault of my right hon. Friend, nor is it the fault of the Government, but because of the opposition coming from other quarters of the House, that an independent Committee has not been appointed before now to ascertain the justice or otherwise of the amount to be paid to Ireland.

**MR. J. DILLON**: It is the principle I object to.

**\*SIR JOHN GORST**: That is quite another matter. With regard to the fund, there is little doubt that it is at present insolvent. The actuarial calculations in 1885, after the fund had been only five years in operation, was necessarily based a good deal on conjecture or opinion rather than upon fact; but the calculation made in 1891, after more than ten years' experience, was to a much greater extent based on fact as distinct from opinion, and therefore it is more likely to be correct. However that may be, I can assure the House that every single penny of that £90,000 will go to the benefit of the teachers, whatever may be the results of the investigation of experts. Supposing the fund is proved to be solvent, then the whole of the £90,000 will go to the benefit of the Irish teachers; and if it be insolvent, the money will go to relieve the teachers from the reductions which they might otherwise be compelled to submit to. I think it only right that the House should understand the question, and I think I have made plain the reasons for submitting the Vote now before the House.

(7.42.) **SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH**: It is gratifying to find that the whole of this money should be going to the teachers. But, at the same time, it is right that attention should be called to the loose way in which public money is

being dealt with. I think this should not be left to Irish Members, and that the House has reason to complain that, although the Government and the House are alike in the dark as to the state of this fund, a Vote should be asked for.

(7.50.) MR. SEXTON: I must confess that this whole arrangement looks excessively awkward. Three explanations have already been placed before the House, and it is difficult to understand any one of them. I should say that if the English Government persist in managing Irish affairs in this fashion, Irishmen will be justified in the impression that they can manage their affairs better themselves. I do not admit the distinction the Secretary to the Treasury attempts to draw between school teachers and the Constabulary, and I contend that the school teachers are just as much officers of State as any other body of men, and that they should be treated accordingly. In fact, there is a large amount of suspended judgment in regard to this Vote, and I think it is perfectly plain that we cannot pass it to-night, considering the important fact that the representations upon which it has been presented are, to say the least of it, inexact. I think the Vote ought to be adjourned until such times as the Report of the Committee of Experts has been placed before the House, and I must protest against the Vote until we have some assurance that the teachers will benefit by the Vote.

SIR JOHN GORST: I wish the Committee to understand that under any circumstances, whatever may be the result of the investigation, the whole of the £90,000 will go to the benefit of the National School teachers.

(7.55.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I understand from the statement of the Secretary to the Treasury that this money is not to benefit a single teacher. Is it not a fact that no existing teacher will get one single penny of benefit out of this £90,000? Let the House recollect that the money ought to be given to the Irish teachers in exactly the same proportion as it was given to the English teachers. It appears from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the Irish teachers are not going to get any benefit from the grant; not one single penny of benefit are they likely to derive.

*Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth*

If you apply the money in this manner it simply means that it is going to make out Treasury balances. I think the teachers, roughly speaking, ought to get £8 or £9 apiece as back money. If you give this £90,000 to the Irish teachers, almost exactly as you have given the money to the English teachers, then you will be doing justice.

MR. JACKSON: With respect to the opinion of the class of persons interested in this matter, I think it right that I should read to the House the following telegram, which I have just received:—

"The Executive Committee of the Irish National teachers authorise me to state that they heartily endorse the allocation of the £90,000 to the pension fund."

From that it appears that the National School teachers highly desire the allocation of the £90,000 to the pension fund; and probably that may assist the House in coming to a decision on the matter.

\*(8.3.) MR. WEBB (Waterford, W.): Our contention is that the Government find that a mistake has been made; it is the Government that ought to pay for that mistake; and the £90,000 ought to be paid additionally to the teachers. The manner in which this is brought before the House is very extraordinary. First we were told that there was a deficit in this fund, then we are told that this was very doubtful and that there is a Committee sitting upon it; and now, when it suits the convenience of the Government, we are told that there is no doubt whatever about it. If there is no doubt whatever about it I do not understand why a Committee should be appointed at all. It has been asserted by the Government that they have not the same responsibility towards the National School teachers as towards the Constabulary of Ireland. We know the Constabulary is considered a more important force in Ireland in the government of the country than the teachers. That the people should become better educated and better able to do for themselves is a matter of small importance. As to the treatment of the Irish National teachers, during the last ten years I have myself known instances where National teachers, because they had opinions of their own as to political questions and political reforms which were afterwards carried out by the

Government, were obliged to give up their situations and leave the country. It is idle to say that the Government are not as much responsible to them as to the Constabulary. I trust this Vote will not be allowed to pass without being brought to a Division.

(8.5.) **MR. PIERCE MAHONY** (Meath, N.): The right hon. Gentleman has just read a telegram which he has received from the Irish National teachers approving of the allocation of this money to the Pension Fund. Perhaps he could also tell us whether the National teachers of Ireland or their Association are aware of how this money is to be applied—whether it is to be applied to the Pension Fund or not?

**MR. JACKSON:** Yes, I should say they are.

**MR. MAHONY:** Might I ask are they aware of the alleged deficit in the Fund? What we are asked to believe is this: that an Association representing the existing body of the National teachers of Ireland wish this sum of money to which they are entitled as individuals to be used for the benefit of teachers in the future—that they wish it to be used for the benefit of a Fund from which they will not derive one single halfpenny. That may be a very praiseworthy state of mind of the Association, but I, for one, have very serious doubts on the subject. I do not believe that the National School Teachers' Association have at all realised how this fund is to be applied. I do not believe that they realise the fact that they as individuals will not benefit to the extent of a single halfpenny if this £90,000 is to be granted to the Fund. That is why the right hon. Gentleman said the Government were not responsible to the present teachers.

**SIR JOHN GORST:** What I said was that the new rules could not be altered as applied to the existing teachers, and that if this fund is inadequate a reduction would be made all round.

**MR. MAHONY:** We are now told that the Treasury of this great Empire makes rules with regard to certain servants.

**SIR JOHN GORST:** With regard to the beneficiaries, the Government make rules under an Act of Parliament

regarding the beneficiaries of a certain statutory fund.

**MR. MAHONY:** The Government make rules with regard to certain of its servants. A Minister of the Crown gets up and says these rules cannot be altered as regards the existing servants of the State. One would naturally suppose that the Government, who were responsible for framing the rules, and who have no power to alter the rules regarding the existing servants of the State—that the Government of this great Empire would at any rate undertake that the servants of the State will receive what they are entitled to. The right hon. Gentleman does not say that if there was a deficit under these rules this House would not make it good. But what we are asked is quite a different matter. We are asked to take this sum of money, this £90,000 to which the National School teachers are entitled and ought to get, and transfer it to a fund which will benefit not the people entitled to this £90,000, but some future teachers in Ireland. I think it is most unjust to the present body of National teachers in Ireland, and I am confident that the telegram sent to the right hon. Gentleman was sent in ignorance of the facts, because the teachers in Ireland at the present moment are not in a position to understand the facts. There seems still to exist a very great doubt regarding this fund. But under any circumstances, whether a deficit exists or not, I do not see how it is just to the present teachers in Ireland to take away this sum of £90,000, to which they are entitled, and put it to a fund which will not benefit them individually, but some future teachers.

(8.15.) **SIR JOSEPH MCKENNA** (Monaghan, S.): I believe this to be absolutely a misappropriation of this fund. A fund that was intended for the immediate benefit of the teachers in Ireland is, by a Vote in Committee, to be allocated to make good a mistake made by an actuary in the Treasury some years ago. I think this actuary has proved himself unfit to make such calculations at all; and if his calculations in the first instance were wrong, and if they are right now, it does not alter, in my opinion, the appropriation of this £90,000, which was intended for the immediate benefit of the existing teachers. The late Secretary to the



Treasury has read a telegram from the secretary of the teacher's body in Ireland or some other representative. I should like to know in reply to what communication that was read.

MR. JACKSON: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to say that no communication was made; that the telegram came to me quite spontaneously, and was received by me quite unexpectedly, and that is all I know about it.

SIR JOSEPH McKENNA: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman has given entirely what has occurred; but I venture to think that the gentleman who sent it was entirely ignorant of the circumstances which surround this question; and, therefore, I think we should treat the matter as if the telegram had not been sent at all, and we must fall back upon our own common sense in this matter. I hope that when this Vote is put from the Chair every Irish Member in the House, on whatever side of the House he may sit, will vote against such a misappropriation, for it appears to me to be a misappropriation of this Fund.

\*(8.17.) MR. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.): We have been told, and we have no reason to doubt the statement, that there is a deficit of £195,000. The Chief Secretary and the Secretary to the Treasury say that unless this deficit is made good new rules would have to be made; but we are told at the same time that the rules cannot be changed; so that the existing teachers are concerned. But are we to understand that a deficit exists to the extent of £195,000, that the teachers are to suffer, and that the Government will not make it good? As regards the case of the Constabulary, it has been very well pointed out by the hon. Member for South Tyrone and the hon. Member for West Belfast that this fund was not a fund originally started by the Government, but contributed to by the police themselves, and therefore stands in the same position as the Teachers' Pension Fund, so far as Government responsibility was concerned. Neither the teachers of Ireland nor the people had anything whatever to say to the administration of this fund, and I do not think that either the teachers or the Irish people should be made responsible for it. I think, before this Vote passes,

*Sir Joseph McKenna*

it ought to be made clear whether the Government intend to make good the deficit, and whether steps should not be taken in future to see that the fund was kept in a sound condition?

\*(8.20.) MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): I entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. The remedy which the Government propose is the old one of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I do not think the House ought to consent to any such bargain with them. As has been pointed out by more than one Member of the House with regard to their dealing with the police, wherever the money came from, the Government always took care that those who were breaking men's heads should get their pay, and there have been a large number of men pensioned for breaking people's heads, and for no other reason that I know of. And it has been often pointed out that while the police are paid big salaries and pensions the poor teachers, who are endeavouring to develop the brain-power of the people and give them an education, are utterly neglected. With nothing except coercion from the present Government during the past five years, the people have been told that they are not fit for Home Rule; but I think that the mismanagement of this Fund shows that the British Government is not fit to administer the funds of the country at all. What would be the action of the Government if this happened in a Board of Guardians in Ireland? I have known several Boards of Guardians, composed of men who gave their services voluntarily to the public service, who came long distances at their own expense to attend the Board meetings, and the Boards got into debt. What was the procedure? Why, they were suspended at once. They were not paid large salaries, like Members of the Government, for looking after the public interest, but they were suspended peremptorily by an order from Dublin Castle. And the coming County Councils that are going to be newly appointed are to be put into the dock for less than this. I should like we had the power to put the Government in the dock for such administration as has been disclosed in this House to-night. I shall resist the passing of this Vote until the assurance is given that this deficit is to be made

good. I am quite of opinion that if the gentlemen—the associated Irish teachers—on whose behalf this telegram has been sent to the Chief Secretary, were aware of the fact that this money is gone astray and that they are likely to be deprived of it entirely, they would not have sent any such telegram. I shall not trespass on the time of the House any longer, but I hope every hon. Member in the House will press this question until we get an assurance that the Government will make good the deficit. If the gentleman who was in control of this fund was in a City counting-house and could not account for his employers' money they would put the detectives on his track, and keep him under observation until they got satisfactory evidence on the subject. We have got responsible Ministers under observation, and we will keep them there until we have got sufficient satisfaction on the subject.

(8.25.) COLONEL NOLAN: I look upon this case as one calling for the most careful investigation. This is one of the few cases that come before the House of Commons in which Irishmen can actually obtain money for a very valuable class in Ireland, and a considerable sum—£90,000—by forcing this question on the attention of the country. I suppose the telegram from the National Teachers' Association was from some members sitting in Dublin, and who had got some short account that £90,000 was to be allocated for the Pension Fund, and they thought they would relieve their feelings by trying to get a larger pension. I do not believe—I say it is impossible—that the report of this Debate that occurred here up to eight o'clock could have reached them; and they have evidently sent this telegram in sublime ignorance of everything that has happened in this House. I always suspected that this £90,000 would be collared; I always suspected that some of this £90,000 would be taken away from the teachers. The teachers have not had their suspicions aroused; but if they heard the position taken up by the Secretary to the Treasury to-night I think they would alter their opinion. In 1879 certain calculations were made, and in 1885 the Treasury suggested that it would be well if the fund could be stretched out a little more. Then as re-

gards these quinquennial periods, the Secretary to the Treasury has not been exactly frank with us.

SIR JOHN GORST: There was a quinquennial period in 1884; in 1885 new rules were made. They came into force in 1886, and the new quinquennial period was therefore 1891.

COLONEL NOLAN: The actuary has made no suggestion that his calculations in 1885 were wrong; but supposing they are wrong, they have no right to take this £90,000 simply to rectify the error of one of their own officials. I do think this £90,000 ought to be given to the teachers. It will really be a great deal to them, and will help to place them on a footing of equality with the English teachers.

\*(9.5.) MR. LENG (Dundee): I should not have interfered in the discussion upon Irish Estimates if I did not feel that this was not entirely an Irish question. We are suffering from the strange fatality which has attended all proposals resulting from the vicious system of finance introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in creating a surplus by levying taxes before knowing that its object was approved by the country, and then fishing for other purposes to which that surplus might be applied. We Scotch Members spent a whole night last week in discussing the equivalent grant for Scotland, and then towards midnight it was found that our whole time had been wasted; and here to-night it must be admitted that the Committee is in a financial muddle. We are told that there is a deficit of £195,000 on the Report of an actuary in the service of the country. But the Government are not satisfied, or they would not have appointed two other actuaries to make inquiries. If all three were to be unanimous, it would be an exceedingly suspicious, and almost unprecedented, circumstance. It may prove that the deficit is less, and if so this Vote will be too much; or it may prove that the deficit is even greater than has been reported, and then this Vote will not be enough. But whether the deficit is too much or too little, I agree with hon. Gentlemen from Ireland that this money should not be applied to the Pension Fund, but should be devoted to educational purposes, and that before the

money is so allocated further explanations are required.

(9.12.) MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): In the course of the few remarks I made a few nights ago on the introduction of the Government Bill, I stated that I should not oppose the appropriation of £90,000 for increasing the National Teachers' Fund, and I feel, therefore, it is necessary for me to offer some explanation of the Motion I am now about to make for reporting Progress. It is in no spirit of opposition to the appropriation of the £90,000 that I make this Motion, but because I object to taking a leap in the dark as we are invited to do by the Government this evening. There is every reason for delay. A sort of appeal *ad misericordiam* has been made to us on behalf of the teachers; but I hold it would be the falsest economy to devote this sum to bolstering up a fund which needs to be investigated. No damage can be done to the teachers by withholding this grant for a little time; for the £90,000 will still be there, and will be increased by interest while it is invested. What the Irish teachers want is a fund administered on a solid basis. They wish to have established a permanent, solvent, and properly-managed fund; and if the £90,000 be added to it, when it has been placed on a solid basis, it will be a substantial advantage to the teachers; but according to the proposition now made it would only be a something thrown in to fill up a gap. For these reasons I beg to move that you now report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(Mr. J. O'Connor.)

(9.20.) MR. JACKSON: I do not believe the hon. Member thinks for a moment that the Government will consent to report Progress. The case has been stated with great clearness by the Secretary to the Treasury; but hon. Members opposite have seemed to lose sight of or to ignore the fact that if this fund has been brought into this condition, it is because too large an amount of benefit has been given to the teachers who have been admitted to it. It is quite clear from the Act that it is our duty from time to time to have these

Mr. Leng

actuarial valuations made, and it is also clear that it is open to the Treasury from time to time to vary, revoke, or alter the terms and rules regulating the distribution of the pensions. There can only be two alternatives: either we must use this money to add to the Pension Fund, or changes must be made which will give to the teachers less benefit. I have already stated that I am informed that the Teachers' Association endorse the allocation of the £90,000 in the manner now proposed, but I think the Member for West Belfast was not in his place when I read the telegram.

MR. SEXTON: I have heard of it.

MR. JACKSON: I only mention it because the hon. Member referred to a letter received from teachers taking a different view.

MR. J. O'CONNOR: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the teachers who signed that telegram are aware of the unsatisfactory state of the fund, as it has been stated here?

MR. JACKSON: I have told the Committee all I know on the subject of the telegram, which came quite unexpectedly; but I think the question is one of such interest to the teachers that they will have already very closely followed what has been said upon the subject. After listening carefully to the speeches made this evening, I see no reason for reporting Progress, or for altering in any degree the proposed allocation of the grant. It belongs to the teachers only, and the Fund cannot be diverted to any other purpose than for benefitting them. It was intended, when the Act was passed, that the interest on £1,300,000, plus the contributions of the teachers themselves, should be so dealt with that the benefits to be given should not exceed the resources of the fund so constituted. Up to 1885 the experience was short, and the actuarial valuation then made showed that there was a surplus. For some time past the teachers desired, and they still desire, as hon. Members from Ireland must be aware, to get larger benefits from the Fund, and that in many ways modifications should be made. There is no doubt that in 1885 the Treasury, believing that the condition of the fund justified some relaxation of the rules, assented to some increased benefits being given to the teachers. There are many

ways in which the question of solvency can be affected, and I may mention what has been the result of increasing the age at which teachers are admitted. It is obvious that if they are admitted at a later age than formerly, the tendency is to limit the period of years during which they will be on the Fund. There has been a growing tendency for teachers to pass examinations so as to enable them to get into the second and first classes, and the proportion of teachers in the first, second, and third classes is so much altered from what it was that there is in the Fund a very much higher percentage of the first and second class, and a very much less percentage of the third class.

**MR. SEXTON:** Do they not pay into the fund according to their class salary?

**MR. JACKSON:** No; they do not pay according to their class salary, and that is rather important. In the Act the number of the first and second class is limited, and the result is that supposing the number of the first class was limited to 150, although there may be 400 of the first class on the Fund, only 150 can contribute towards it, according to the first-class salary. Supposing a teacher is classed as a first class, and in receipt of a first-class salary, if he does not contribute to the Fund as a first-class teacher, and supposing he retired, and was pensioned during that period, he would only be pensioned in accordance with the second class, he having contributed as a second-class teacher. But it must be borne in mind that the limit is only as regards contributions to the fund, and not as to the number of pensions to be given.

**MR. SEXTON:** Does the right hon. Gentleman say that a man who can pay only at the second-class rate may get a first-class pension?

**MR. JACKSON:** I mean to say that he may have paid at the second-class rate up to last year—I am putting this as a mere illustration, and not binding myself to any particular order—and then this year get into the first class; and if then he happened to be pensioned, he would be pensioned on the first-class rate. When the valuation was made in 1885 and it was found there was this surplus, there was an anxiety to give the teachers the benefit of this improvement in the Fund. Now, further experience goes to

show that the additional advantages given at that time have been just sufficient to turn the scale in the opposite direction. I have given very anxious consideration to the question. I think it is of great importance that we should take this opportunity of making this contribution to the Fund. There is no doubt the question will have to be faced as to what is going to be done with regard to the Fund. No doubt the Fund shows a deficit on the valuation; but the Treasury, in order to be quite certain about the matter, have decided to have the actuarial valuation again checked. I do not think there is the smallest hope that they will be able to show that the valuation that has been made is otherwise than a correct one. It will be some time before we can know the result of the further examination that is being made; but I put it to hon. Members—assuming what I have said to be correct, that there has been a disposition to give more to the teachers than the fund would bear—is there any purpose to which we could devote this money that would be more agreeable and more satisfactory to the teachers themselves? It is desirable, if we can, to maintain the advantages that have been given to the teachers under the old rules. It is very undesirable, I think, to alter these rules if we can avoid it; but the alternative is either to make this contribution now or endeavour to modify, it may be, the conditions under which the Fund has been administered so that there should be brought about a state of solvency. With regard to the school fees, it may be that they will have to continue even for a while longer—certainly until we get our Education Bill passed. I do not know what may be the view taken in the future, but I do feel it is incumbent upon us, now that we have found out the position we are in with regard to the Fund, to make this contribution to it, and this is the view of the Teachers' Association. I believe this is a wise allocation of the money, and I hope the Committee will not agree to reporting Progress, but allow us to take the Vote.

(9.35.) **DR. CLARK (Caithness):** I think the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman are rather in favour of reporting Progress, because the Government have no right to ask us to vote

this money until they are satisfied it is really required and until they verify their facts. When they have verified their facts and know the exact amount of money they want, then they can come to Parliament and ask us to vote the money. I think this is the first time since I have been in the House that I have seen a real Irish financial grievance. I will also support the Motion on another ground. I think the Government would have been wise if they had adopted the precedent of the Irish Constabulary Pension Fund, and voted the money in the same fashion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The Motion before the Committee is to report Progress. If the discussion on the Vote is to go on, the Motion to report Progress should be withdrawn.

DR. CLARK: I was going to argue that it is desirable for the Government on many grounds to withdraw this Vote altogether and bring it up in another shape. The statement of the Chief Secretary for Ireland is rather in favour of reporting Progress. Let the Treasury wait until they have verified their facts and figures, and then come before us and tell us what they have done.

(9.40.) COLONEL NOLAN: I think there is a good case to be made out for postponing the Vote, to give us an opportunity of knowing what the teachers of Ireland think of the matter themselves. I think it would be better for the Secretary to the Treasury to withdraw the Vote now. It is so unbusiness-like on the part of the Treasury to come down here and ask us to come suddenly to a decision on a question of figures, when we have heard for the first time of these actuarial calculations. We have only gradually extracted from the Treasury a good many of the financial facts. We have drawn them out one by one but we do not yet know the whole facts of the case. If the Vote was postponed for three or four days and all the figures were laid on the Table, we would then be in a better position to come to a decision. The Government may frighten the teachers, but I do not think they will frighten the Irish Members. We know that in the long run the money will come back to the teachers in some way or other. I think a very fair case has been made out for postponing this Vote. We

*Dr. Clark*

have not the materials in our possession for forming a correct conclusion upon the matter. The Government themselves are not thoroughly well informed, and perhaps, in a day or two they will be properly coached by the officials of the Treasury.

(9.43.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope hon. Members will not press this Motion. The way matters stand is this I do not propose to traverse again the grounds so admirably mapped out by my right hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury. This money will go to the Irish teachers, whether the Fund be insolvent, whether it be solvent, or whether it be more than solvent. If it be insolvent, the money will go to diminish the insolvency; if it be solvent it will go to increase the benefits to the teachers; if it be more than solvent, it will still go to the same excellent object. Whatever the condition of the fund, and whatever the actuarial calculations ultimately determined upon by the various experts, this £90,000 will go to the Teachers' Pension Fund in augmentation of the money they would otherwise derive. That, at all events, is perfectly clear, and I do not propose to dwell upon it any longer. Now, what hon. Members say is this—“There is an inquiry going on to investigate the precise amount of the deficiency. Wait until the inquiry has come to a conclusion before asking for a Vote of this money.” These calculations are of so difficult and laborious a character that there is not the slightest possibility that they can be completed and in the hands of Members before the end of the financial year. I do not pretend that the £90,000 is not due to Ireland. I think it is due to Ireland. I think it extremely doubtful if the thing is hung up whether the Vote will go to the teachers at all. The teachers, as teachers, have no claim to it whatever. If you are going to follow in Ireland the precise analogy of England it will go to the parents, and not to the teachers. There are in Ireland large bodies of public opinion desirous of promoting technical education among other most valuable objects. Let it be understood if this Vote is adjourned it will not come on in the course of the Parliamentary financial year, and the money will this year go to the extinction of the National Debt. There is no ques-

tion about that, and when, either in this Session or some subsequent Session, this House took into consideration the things to which this money shall be voted, there is no security or probability that it will necessarily go to the particular object to which this Government desire to vote it. Under these circumstances, I ask hon. Gentlemen not to postpone indefinitely the decision of this question to-night. There is other very pressing and important Business of interest to Irish Members before us, and I would ask them to be content with a Debate which has proved this, at all events, conclusively: that whatever is the state of the Fund the Irish National teachers will benefit by this allocation, and let us pass to other not less interesting and important matters.

(9.47.) Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): The Government have changed their ground considerably since the opening of the Debate. When this Debate opened to-night, the evidence before us was a positive declaration that a deficit had arisen which this grant of £90,000 would partly meet. Now, the First Lord rises and delivers a strictly hypothetical statement. He says, "If there be a deficiency this grant will go to meet it."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt there is a deficiency.

Mr. SEXTON: He put it in the form that if there is any deficiency this money will go to the teachers. That is what I do not see. These teachers are entitled to certain benefits. They will receive no new benefits unless new rules are made. What assurance have we that new rules will be made?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: This £90,000 may be considered as added to the £1,113,000. The Treasury are bound to make rules by which that £1,113,000 will be allocated to the teachers.

Mr. SEXTON: There are two sets of rules. The teachers are entitled to certain benefits, and these benefits must be made good by the Treasury. ["No!"] Does the Chief Secretary mean by that "no," that after men and women have been paying into this Pension Fund you can alter these rules so as to take away the benefits conferred on them? I say that is impossible. There is a contract, amounting to a statutory contract, between the Treasury and the teachers, and it would be impossible to alter it.

VOL. I. [NEW SERIES.]

We have no means of satisfying ourselves, if we were to vote this money, that it would secure the teachers any further benefit. That would be at the discretion of the Treasury. We know how plausible the Treasury is at the moment when it is seeking a concession, and how slippery it is afterwards. I am sorry the First Lord has made an attempt to overbear Members of Parliament by threatening us that unless we consent to pass this Vote the money will not go to the teachers. What right has the right hon. Gentleman to take to dictating to the Committee?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The postponement is asked for on the ground that the investigation is not terminated, and it will not be terminated before the end of the financial year.

Mr. SEXTON: Is it not strange that the right hon. Gentleman is able to say the valuation will not be completed before the 31st March? Upon what day were these gentlemen set to work? Where is the letter appointing them? How long have they been at work? How long will they be at work? Did the actuary who made the calculation of 1891 make any Report? If he made a Report that the fund is £90,000 to the bad, let that Report be produced. I suppose all the business at the Treasury is not by word of mouth. There is, I suppose, some written correspondence. I hope it will not be considered too much to ask that proof of the deficiency of last year should be placed in our hands. I think I can throw some light on the telegram which the Chief Secretary read. I take it that the telegram came from the Executive Body of the National teachers in Dublin.

Mr. JACKSON: Yes.

Mr. SEXTON: That is a body of 20 gentlemen living in Dublin who have sent the telegram without sufficient information, and probably because these gentlemen were aware that last year the right hon. Gentleman, who is now First Lord, proposed to apply this £90,000 to his Irish Land Purchase Act reserve fund which has not worked at all. The teachers naturally preferred that the money should be given to the Pension Fund rather than to the Purchase Act reserve fund. I beg the Committee therefore to discount the telegram from the Executive of the National teachers. I

3 N

would respectfully ask the First Lord if he can see his way to accept the Motion to report Progress. I cannot honestly vote away £90,000 without knowing why. Let him consent to the adjournment, so that he may procure some general memorandum from the three actuaries, or else show us the document upon which the actuaries calculated last year that the fund was in an unsound state. If he does so, I do not think he will find the progress of Business has been injured.

(9.55.) MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I say we have no information to justify the statement that there is any deficit at all. The actuarial calculation of 1883, which was very elaborate, is now in the Library. The actuarial valuation of 1891 has been carefully concealed by the Government, until it suited their purpose to quote it; and they have quoted it without putting it on the Table, or supplying Members with the information it contains. It is very curious that we have not seen this document showing that there is a deficiency. The right hon. Gentleman, now the First Lord, when he was Chief Secretary, made a statement as to the capital of this fund in the month of May, and from that it appears that the interest alone on the £1,300,000 was £39,000, showing a surplus of £2,000 on that item alone. Besides that, you were receiving from the National Debt Commissioners £8,000 by way of interest and premiums to the extent of £9,000 a year. Therefore, you had a surplus of £20,000, and that fact is borne out by this, that you transferred from income to capital account last year no less than £27,000.

MR. JACKSON: I think the hon. Gentleman overlooks the fact that what he has quoted is the question of receipts and expenditure. The question of solvency depended upon the actuarial estimate of what will happen to the Fund in the course of years when certain charges fall upon it.

MR. A. O'CONNOR: The explanation appears to be a little elementary. Anyone can make this calculation for himself. I have been at the trouble to check the calculation of 1885, and I think I can see one or two points on which the actuary has made a mistake. I am not at all satisfied that the

*Mr. Sexton*

actuarial estimate laid before the Treasury for the year 1891 is any more accurate than the actuarial estimate made in 1885. Before I am asked to vote on the strength of it, I should like to see the actuarial estimate examined. The First Lord of the Treasury says this £90,000 is to go to the teachers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said it belongs to Ireland, and that we propose to give it to the teachers.

MR. A. O'CONNOR: The right hon. Gentleman appeared to lead the House to suppose that he was speaking in the interest of the teachers. He was not doing so. He was speaking in the interest of the Government, as shown plainly by the words of the Act. The 7th section says—

"If at any time the Pension Fund shall be insufficient for the repayment of the advances by the National Debt Commissioners for the pensions payable to the teachers, the Treasury, upon being informed thereof by the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt, shall issue the amount of such deficiency out of the Consolidated Fund, and the growing produce thereof, and the Treasury shall certify such deficiency to Parliament."

So that, in reality, this apparent anxiety for the interest of the teachers is merely an anxiety to save the Treasury; and in order to enable the Treasury to perform this little evolution we are asked to vote in the dark a sum of £90,000, which it is admitted ought to go to benefit the position of the teachers, but which the First Lord thinks will go to pay part of the National Debt. It is mere affectation for the First Lord of the Treasury to say that whatever happens to this Fund the teachers can suffer. You have entered into a contract with every one of them. The interests of the teachers will not be hurt in any way if this question be held over till we have an opportunity of seeing the actuarial report.

\*(10.2.) SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe): It seems to me that the Government are in this position. They find themselves under two obligations to Ireland. The first obligation is to give to Ireland, in some shape or form, this grant of £90,000, or whatever sum may be her fair proportion equivalent to that given to England in the form of the fee grant. The other obligation is to keep this Teachers' Pension Fund in a state of solvency. If this Fund

were to break down it would be a great disappointment to a large number of teachers, and the Act says that under certain circumstances the Treasury is to meet any deficiency out of the Consolidated Fund.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR:** The clause to which the right hon. Gentleman refers is one dealing with the capital sum. There is a schedule stating certain benefits which the teachers are to receive, and that would appear to involve an obligation on the Treasury, but if hon. Gentlemen will look at Clause 11 of the Act they will see that it provides—

"That the rules and schedules of this Act may from time to time be revoked, varied, and added to by the Lords of the Treasury."

The duty of the Treasury is simply to see that any teacher gets such pension or benefit as his contributions to the Fund may justify, and that the rules under which teachers receive benefit from the Fund shall, if necessary, be varied in such a way as to keep the Fund solvent, not out of the taxes or funds voted by Parliament, but out of the £1,300,000 of the Irish Church surplus.

**SIR JOHN GORST:** The clause is no obligation at all—it only applies to such advances as are made from time to time out of the Consolidated Fund, which are to be repaid to the Consolidated Fund. The Act provides—

"That the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt may from time to time until the payment of the whole of the said capital sum of £1,300,000 make advances for the purposes of the Act, and may apply for that purpose any funds for the time being in their hands. All such advances shall be repaid to the Commissioners out of the pension fund, with interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum. If at any time the Pension Fund shall be insufficient for the repayment of such advances, the Treasury, on being duly informed of it by the Commissioners, shall issue the amount of such deficiency out of the Consolidated Funds of the United Kingdom or out of the growing produce thereof."

The 7th clause is a provision for advances by the Commissioners till the Irish Church surplus is realised, and for the subsequent repayment of such advances.

**\*SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH:** The right hon. Gentleman does not answer my point. Supposing this Fund were to be in a much worse state of deficit than was reported last year, do right hon.

Gentlemen opposite mean to say that all they would have to do would be to so whittle down the rules that the expectations held out to the teachers would be falsified? Is it not a fact that they must come to Parliament to make the Fund solvent? It does seem to me there are two obligations: an obligation to pay Ireland an equivalent sum in respect of the fee grants in England; and the other, an old obligation, to keep the Pension Fund solvent. They are trying to meet both obligations by one payment. That is very ingenious on the part of right hon. Gentlemen, but I am not surprised that hon. Gentlemen from Ireland do not look upon the matter in quite the same light.

Question put.

(10.10.) The Committee divided:—  
Ayes 106; Noes 132.—(Div. List, No. 10.)

Original Question again proposed.

(10.20.) **MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.):** I think it would be well if the Vote were postponed in order that the Committee may have time to get some knowledge of the actuarial report which is now being prepared. No harm can be done by delay. It is very strange that a Fund which was £196,000 to the good in 1885 should be £195,000 to the bad now. The Chief Secretary read a telegram from the Executive of the Irish National Teachers' Association, but we are prepared in the interests of that body to take the responsibility of postponing the Vote. The question of this £90,000 also involves another consideration. The right hon. Gentleman in his argument assumes that there will be a deficit in a very short time; that the actuarial valuation when properly worked out will show a deficit of £195,000; but, Sir, the Government are not sure of that, and I think the Committee is entitled to a fair statement on the matter. The Treasury are not in a position to give us such a statement to-night, and they should, therefore, allow the Vote to be postponed for a week, during which time independent actuaries, of whom there are many connected with large insurance companies, might be employed to work out the calculation. The Chief Secretary was the only Member of the Front Bench who endeavoured to give some explana-



tion of how the deficiency arose, but he was dealing hypothetically with a certain state of things. We want to see exactly how the fund stands. If there is a necessity for £90,000 and the teachers are entitled to it I should be inclined to vote for it. I hope the Government will not press the Vote on to-night, but will bring it forward again when the Irish people, and especially the teachers, will be in a position to judge how the Fund stands at the present moment.

(10.30.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I take the result of the last Division as showing that, though we are in a minority, we are at the same time sufficiently strong to be recognised in this House. The Division has only resulted in a majority of 26 to Her Majesty's Ministers, and I think that fact in itself should be sufficient to remind them to stay their hand. I would suggest that the Report stage in connection with this matter should not be brought on for at least a fortnight, and that before then the figures should be placed in the hands of hon. Members showing what the actual state of the fund really is. This I think would be a proper course for the Government to adopt, having regard to the confusion that exists in the minds of most hon. Members in regard to the figures.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no objection to the Report stage being postponed for a fortnight, as is suggested by the hon. Member; but what I desire to say is that, after the prolonged debate, and, to say the least of it, the exhaustive debate which has taken place, I think the Vote should now be allowed to be taken, so that the House may proceed with some other business.

(10.40.) MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.): I think it must be plain to every Member of the House that the Government are obliged to make good this deficit, and I do not see why the Irish National School teachers should lose in consequence of the default of the Government. I think the Irish National School teachers are being unfairly treated, and that in all the relations of the Government with them their interests have not been fairly considered. I think that the Government are much to blame in this matter, and that the real reason why they should make good the deficit out of Imperial Funds. If there is any new statement which the Government have to make before we go

*Mr. Flynn*

to a Division, of course we should like to hear it. But if that is the position of the Government, that they cannot alter these rules as regards the present staff of teachers, then the present staff of teachers—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

(10.45.) The Committee divided:—  
Ayes 146; Noes 113.—(Div. List, No. 11.)

Original Question put accordingly,

"That a sum, not exceeding £90,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, as a Grant in Aid of the Capital of the Pension Fund created under the provisions of 'The National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1879.'"

(10.50.) The Committee divided:—  
Ayes 157; Noes 120.—(Div. List, No. 12.)

Resolution to be reported.

#### CLASS VII.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £30,486, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for certain Expenditure in connection with the Relief of Distress in Ireland."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I do not intend to oppose the grant of this money, nor do I complain of the money spent last year in relief of distress in Ireland. My observations refer rather to details of administration of the money than to complaint as to the amount of relief afforded. As far as I have been able to ascertain the distress was fully met and adequately dealt with. I do not believe any people in the West of Ireland were left in a state of destitution, and I am perfectly prepared to give credit to the Government for that. Now, Sir, the circumstances that surrounded the institution of these works for the relief of distress leads me to observe that, although representing one of the districts in which most of the money was spent, I had no opportunity of addressing the House on the subject last year. When the know-

ledge came to us twelve months ago that the West of Ireland was threatened with one of those famines which have unhappily become an institution in Ireland we made an appeal to the Government to investigate this matter, and to take immediate steps for the relief of this distress. Sir, as on previous occasions, our early representations were met with contempt and derision, and it was said that we were raising the cry of pauperism. I can recollect the cruel and insulting articles that appeared in the *Times*, and the speeches delivered by some gentlemen connected with the Government treating our warnings with contempt. It was not until a somewhat serious and prolonged agitation had taken place in the West that we could induce the Government to take any steps. The then Chief Secretary was engaged in that recreation in which he is so accomplished a master, and we could not even discover his address. It was only after repeated meetings, and after speeches of a strongly condemnatory character, that the right hon. Gentleman awoke to the seriousness of the situation in Ireland. The present Chief Secretary went to Ireland carrying with him a small box or basket of potatoes, which somebody stole and substituted others. He returned to this country and represented our statements as grossly exaggerated. The events that have occurred since, and the enormous expenditure, of which this Vote forms part, prove that we understated rather than overstated the case. After a strong appeal from the Member for Newcastle, in answer to urgent invitations, and goaded to some extent by the reproaches made against him, the Chief Secretary made a desperate resolution, and for the first time in the five years of his government of Ireland he marched away from Dublin, and, with feelings something like those which animated Stanley when he embarked on the Congo, he advanced to the Shannon and crossed that terrible river. I was in America at the time, and day after day I read columns of telegrams describing the progress of the right hon. Gentleman as if it were a march of an army in a hostile country, and it seemed wonderful to the Americans that there was no terrible loss of life or injury to limb. I never thought there was anything to fear, and I think the Chief Secretary made a

remarkably good departure in acquainting himself with the people and with the country that he governed. The sights he saw led to his mind being aroused for the first time as to the true condition of the people in those districts, and the fact of his going through had a good deal to do with the very liberal scale on which relief was afforded to those people. As regards the distribution of that relief, I cannot resist the conviction that it was, to a considerable extent, affected by the nature of the right hon. Gentleman's reception. The Magistrates behaved in the most reprehensible fashion by telling the people that if they did not give the right hon. Gentleman a warm welcome they would suffer. I believe that in some districts the right hon. Gentleman was welcomed with a small and miserable appearance of hospitality, and that the people received more than their due share. That is a very unfortunate thing, and unfortunate that any impression should have been left in the minds of the people that this relief was employed for the purpose of furthering political objects. I am sure the people of this country would not approve such a proceeding. You can always get a good idea of what is in the mind of the Government by studying *The Times*. They sent a special correspondent down to the West towards the close of last summer, and he gave a most magnificent account of the result of these relief works, and described the gratitude of the people, and threw a flood of light upon the views of the official classes in Ireland. As regards the administration of the fund, it was placed mainly or altogether in the hands of the police. One of the extra items in this Vote is £1,400 as extra pay to the police for acting as gaugers, time-keepers, overseers, &c., in connection with the relief works, and of that item I should like some explanation. If the work of overseeing and time-keeping on the relief works was done by constabulary men and officers, who were amply paid for all their work, the sum of £1,410 for distributing £30,000 is an enormously excessive amount for extra pay to these men. The First Lord of the Treasury consulted the Catholic priest, and gave them a large voice in putting men on the relief works, and to that extent neutralised the mischievous influence of the police; but, making due

allowance for that fact, the use of the police was not a wise or proper course. There is another matter connected with this system of relief works which is worth bringing under the attention of the Committee. I represent one of the poorest districts in Ireland, and the right hon. Gentleman has treated my district in a liberal fashion. In the first place, he ran a railway right through the middle of it, which I never asked him for—if I had asked him for it, I might not have got it—and he has greatly benefited the people. He disbursed £13,000 in the Barony of Swineford, which includes one of the poorest populations of Ireland. When these famines occur, and anyone comes down amongst the people—as the right hon. Gentleman did, much to his credit—who has the power of giving them relief, it is impossible for his humanity to resist the demand made upon him by the condition of these people. But what I have always urged upon this House is, that the system of waiting for a famine to come and then bringing in a Bill for relief is one of the most wretched, degrading, and hopeless systems ever undertaken by an Executive Government. Yet this has been going on in our unfortunate country for the last hundred years. Nothing is done in the intervals to take away the root of the evils; and when distress recurs, we are compelled to raise an agitation for relief; and no Government system of relief was ever applied to a people without leaving behind it frightful demoralisation. The whole financial system of the West of Ireland is thoroughly rotten. If we take the Union of Swineford, we find a population of 53,700 people, with an annual valuation of only £1,000; and it is a remarkable fact, full of sorrowful significance, that in that Union the population is not decreasing, although emigration is taking place from other districts. As to the economic condition of this district during the last ten years, I may say that before this latest distress I had a calculation made which showed that there had been spent there from external resources £110,000 in public charity and relief works within ten years; and that in the same Union, within the same time, £300,000 had been paid in rent largely taken away by the absentee landlords. Was there ever heard of in the whole world such folly as

*Mr. Dillon*

this? Look, again, what happened this year. The right hon. Gentleman spent £26,634 out of this fund, and very probably £4,000 out of the other fund which he collected from the public. I do not suppose that he spent less than £10,000 or £15,000 on the railway, and at least the sum of £35,000 has been spent from the Public Exchequer and private charity from outside sources to keep the people alive in that Union; and yet the landlords, who do not subscribe to these charities, have taken their rents out of this money. It is a most deplorable system, and it is humiliating to us to have to come to this House as paupers when we know that that this is an artificial condition of things. Yet I was threatened with the bayonets of British soldiers and the batons of policemen because I endeavoured to address my constituents on this subject. I was forbidden by a Magistrate to point out to them that they were bound in duty, as well as entitled in morality, to hold for their children and their wives the products of their labour. The right hon. Gentleman sent his troops down at great expense to stop me; but he had to come down afterwards and spend public money there. I am glad to have this opportunity of telling the English House of Commons that it is a fraud on the charity of this country that the absentee landlords of Swineford, and other districts in the West of Ireland, should be allowed to take their rents out of the charity of the English people. I am aware that the right hon. Gentleman in his answer to me will point to the Congested Districts Board, and say the course I have urged has at last been adopted by the Government. I am glad that such a Board has been brought into existence; but I warn the right hon. Gentleman that, as in the case of these relief measures, so in the case of the Congested Districts Board, until you stop the leakage, and do something to bring about a proper economical basis on which to build your structure in the West of Ireland, you are defrauding the people of this country by pretending that these measures can do any permanent or lasting good; while all you are really doing is to increase the security for the rents of the landlords. I am now, as I always have been, ready to meet with friendly

criticism any scheme for improving the condition of our people. I do not care where it comes from—a Conservative or a Liberal Government; but I feel it my duty to point out the economical unsoundness of the present schemes, and I think nothing can be done for the population of the West of Ireland, with any hope of producing good fruit, unless you begin by purchasing, at a fair valuation, the rents of those landlords who are the curse of that country, and have been the cause of its poverty.

(11.38.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot congratulate either the Committee or the hon. Gentleman upon the performance we have just witnessed. (Cries from the Irish Members of "No performance," "the truth," "speech.") The hon. Gentleman speaks not so much as a despairing philanthropist as a disappointed politician. He cannot forgive me for having been one of the instruments by which, not with his assistance, but in his despatch, relief, and immediate relief, was given to the West of Ireland. He cannot conceal the bitterness—(A voice: "Neither can you")—with which he learned that I had travelled through these districts, not guarded by a multitude of police, but without their assistance, and that I was welcomed by his constituents, as by others, in a friendly and generous spirit, and with a full recognition that my object was to make myself better acquainted with their needs; and that my purpose was not, as he seems in his generosity to suppose, to make political capital out of them, but to do something for the relief of the distress about which the hon. Gentleman talks so much and towards mitigating which he does so little. I do not propose to occupy the time of the Committee at any length in dealing with the charges of the hon. Gentleman, but it will be very easy to refute those which have any reference to my own action. The hon. Gentleman appears to think it was not until the Government had listened to the speeches he made in this House and the speeches the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Morley) made outside that we contemplated the possibility of distress in Ireland, or took steps to

relieve it. That is the opinion of other hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. MAC NEILL: Yes. I mentioned that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member's memory is enfeebled by partisanship when he makes such a charge. The facts are these. Before Parliament separated in August, 1890, we, on this side of the House, had sat up all one night, until our proceedings were lightened by the dawn of the day following that on which we began, in order to pass a measure connected with Light Railways, which would enable us to hurry on the employment of labour with a view to meeting impending distress. That measure was resisted by the hon. Gentleman's friends opposite.

MR. SEXTON: I, with several Irish Members, supported the Bill, and a very small minority resisted it.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman had me under arrest at the time, or, at any rate, I was unable to appear here.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I acquit both hon. Gentlemen, the hon. Member for East Mayo because circumstances over which he had no control prevented him from taking part in the proceedings. I do not remember what they were, and with reference to the hon. Member for West Belfast, though I think he joined in some of the Divisions against us, I amply recognise that he did render yeoman service towards the passage of a Bill intended for the future salvation of the poor people in the West of Ireland. But the broad fact remains, we conclusively proved by our action on that night that we contemplated the possibility of distress, and we were already preparing the means to meet that distress; and that, further, we were hampered in our efforts by hon. Gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. What is the use of talking about the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle; there is the broad fact recorded on the Journals of this House conclusively proving who were the friends of Ireland and who were her enemies, who were prepared to help her in her hour of need, and who were prepared to interfere with that assistance if they could only get a little temporary political benefit

thereby. That is enough on this argument, but that is not all I could point out. Long before the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle all the arrangements for my tour in the West were made, and incessant communications were passing between myself and those whose duty it was to deal with distress there. But so much for the manner in which the Government were "spurred on." I now come to the proposition urged by the hon. Member that he, and he alone, has been the apostle of the true doctrine that the distribution of eleemosynary relief is demoralising. I venture to say that no man in or out of the House has urged that doctrine more earnestly and more frequently than myself. I can say that I have not contented myself with urging it in the House and in this country—I went down to the West, and I said it to the people at meetings there; I said it in discussions with priests and local leaders; I did everything in my power to impress on every man having any influence that to suppose that this House or any Government was to continue giving at quinquennial or decennial periods large sums of money for relief was to build hope on the most insecure foundation, and which, even if secure, held out no prospect of permanent amelioration in the condition of the country. I did not confine myself to speeches in this matter. The hon. Gentleman appears to think it is our pleasure to come forward and ask for a Vote from the House for the relief of distress every ten years, and yet to refrain from taking any steps for the relief of the poor population in the West of Ireland. Sir, I claim for this Government, alone among Governments which have existed in Ireland before and since the Union, that we have proposed and carried measures which have for their object the amelioration of the condition of this poor population. We have carried the Light Railways Bill, to which I have already alluded. We proposed it, carried it, and have given effect to it; and if anything is calculated to permanently increase the value of the soil, to improve the fishing industry, and to give to the people who live on that inclement seaboard a chance of competing in the race of life—if anything can give them that chance, it is the railways we have planned, constructed, and paid for.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

That is not the only proposal we have made and carried for dealing permanently with the West of Ireland. The hon. Gentleman has himself alluded to the Congested Districts Board. That Board has at its disposal large funds and ample powers. Its labours, unless legislation interferes, will extend over many years, and in them we have a right to hope that by ceaseless and continued endeavours a great effect will be produced in the amelioration of the conditions of life among those classes with which the Board has to deal. The Board was first proposed in the Land Act of 1890, an Act which I should have thought, on many grounds, had title to the gratitude of the Irish people. But I speak only of this establishment of a Congested Districts Board. Against the Second Reading of that Bill every man below the Gangway opposite voted, including, no doubt, the hon. Member for East Mayo, unless again on that occasion he happened to be otherwise employed. At all events, the whole Party of which he is a distinguished Member united to oppose a measure for dealing specially with the necessities of the West Coast. And after that the hon. Gentleman talks to us as if he had been preaching wisdom to deaf ears, as if he had been the author of a number of bountiful schemes to which we objected, as if he were the enlightened apostle of Irish progress and we the deaf and obtuse obstructives to his beneficent schemes for the welfare of the people. I have heard the hon. Gentleman in countless speeches descant on the woes and wrongs of Ireland, but never in any speech have I heard from him a practical proposition from the day he entered this House until now—unless I am to count among practical propositions the contribution towards the solution of the Irish problem he has been good enough to offer to-day. What is that contribution? It appears, in spite of all evidence ever given, in spite of all elementary principles of public morality, in spite of the obvious forces of economic law, the hon. Member sees no source for Irish regeneration, or amelioration of their condition except in the refusal of Irish tenants to pay their rents. There alone he sees the promised land, there only does he see the dawn of future hope to light his countrymen to political salvation. He comes down to the House with this nostrum

in his pocket, and accuses us who sit on this Bench of incapacity to found a constructive policy for Irish interests and of ignorance of Irish misfortunes. If anything is certain in this world, if there be one truth which the universal experience of mankind has conclusively established, it is that you cannot found the prosperity of a nation on national dishonesty and national disgrace. If we are to take the hon. Gentleman as a Representative of future statesmanship and as a Leader of that future Parliament he hopes to establish in Dublin, if we are to suppose he has laid down the great principles of public policy which are to direct the counsels of the Irish House of Commons, then, indeed, we have more reason than ever to despair of the future of the race he represents. I, Sir, have better hope for Ireland. I believe that deep as is the darkness which appears to have settled over the regions of the West, grinding as is the poverty which, in seasons of distress oppresses the people, nevertheless, partly by their own efforts, partly by the assistance we are able to give them, they will lift themselves out of that slough of poverty and despond, and will become, what I am sure they deserve to become, some of the most worthy, contented, peaceful elements of a great and united people.

(11.44.) MR. MAC NEILL: It is pleasant to observe that in the person of the First Lord of the Treasury we have not lost our old friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland. Speeches of the kind we have just heard will be our charter for the next General Election. I always admired the late Mr. W. H. Smith, but never till now did I recognise that as Leader of the House he was a genius. He did not trade on the animosities between classes, but tried to infuse into our debates his own genial spirit, and regarded us, though opposed to him, as his Colleagues here. How different is the spirit we have just heard. Can any reasonable man fail to see in this exhibition the feeling of a disappointed politician. Again and again the right hon. Gentleman has said he did not go to the West in a political spirit, but his friends undoubtedly have endeavoured to make political capital out of his tour in these districts. The right hon. Gentle-

man has done me the honour to say that possibly my memory is weakened by partisanship, but at least one fact is strongly impressed on my memory. Does the right hon. Gentleman recollect that within the last few weeks a gentleman, full of years and honour, was gathered to his fathers, a gentleman whose counsel was sought on these matters—Sir James Caird—who said two-thirds of the holdings in Ireland are such that no economic rent can be exacted for them? This Debate cannot conclude to-night, but let me say a word on an incident upon which I may enlarge later on when I resume my speech. I met the right hon. Gentleman in Donegal, and very hard I found it to find him. No one seeking an interview with a Royal personage could have had more difficulty. At last I found the right hon. Gentleman, and first I had to ask a Resident Magistrate, who consulted an Inspector, and then applied to the hon. Member for Dover, who acted as diplomatic agent, and at length I was ushered into the presence. Then I found an interview or reception proceeding, which, I suppose, if I had not happened to be there, would have been described as an interview with leading representatives of the district. As a fact, I found the local land agent and the dispensary doctor, surrounded by a group of newspaper men, and in a little time I found that the thing was got up for political capital. Did not the right hon. Gentleman on 3rd October, 1890, write a letter to an American gentleman stating that the distress in Ireland had been got up for political purposes? But see with what little wisdom Irish affairs are governed when, shortly afterwards, he made application here for an enormous sum of money for the relief of that distress. That distress was first emphasized by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, when he made a personal appeal to the Chief Secretary, but the latter would not allow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle "to dictate to him where he should write his letters from."

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow,

Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday.

#### FEE GRANT (SCOTLAND).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Fee Grant in Scotland, and to make provision in regard to the distribution and application of sums from time to time paid to the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account."—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

SIR JOHN GORST: I hope the hon. Member will allow this purely formal stage to be taken. The Resolution will have to be reported to the House, after which the Bill will be introduced by the Lord Advocate. Hon. Members may then address the House, but I hope this purely formal stage will be allowed to pass.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolution to be reported upon Thursday.

#### MILLBANK PRISON BILL.—(No. 140.)

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Thursday.

#### SUPERANNUATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 191).

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

#### LOCAL COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 165.)

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): We made no opposition to the previous Amendments, but to this and subsequent Amendments the Chamber of Commerce

at Belfast a body fully competent to judge of such matters strongly object. Can the Attorney General see his way to accept the opinion of these representatives of the mercantile community at Belfast?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): I cannot at present say I am in a position to withdraw the Amendment of which I have given notice perhaps it will be convenient at this point to report Progress. The Amendments I have put down have been very carefully considered, and they embody the views of the Government. They have been submitted to various authorities, and I shall be glad to consider the view of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Madden.*)

MR. SEXTON: If we resume Committee this day week I hope, meantime the right hon. Gentleman will consult the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. MADDEN: Certainly I will send a copy of the Bill with my Amendment to the Belfast Chamber of Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

#### POST OFFICE MAIL CONTRACT (PORTS MOUTH AND RYDE MAILS).

Resolved, That the Contract with the London and South Western and London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Companies, dated the 10th day of November, 1891, for the conveyance of Mails between Portsmouth and Ryde, be approved.—(*Sir John Gorst.*)

#### MOTIONS.

##### FISHERY LAWS (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Nolan, Bill to amend the Fishery Laws of Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Nolan, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Hayden, and Mr. Maguire.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 224.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 1st March, 1892.*

**EAST INDIA OFFICERS BILL [H.L.]**  
(No. 23.)

Bill reported from the Standing Committee with amendments: The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House (on re-commitment) and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.

**RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.**

Commons Message considered (according to order).

Moved, That this House do concur in the following Resolution communicated by the Commons, viz.—

"That all Bills of the present Session to confirm Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the 'Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888,' containing the classification of merchandise traffic, and the schedule of maximum rates and charges applicable thereto, be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons."—(*The Lord Knutsford.*)

Motion agreed to; and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

**PRESENTATION TO BENEFICES BILL**  
[H.L.]—(No. 24.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: My Lords, the Bill, to which I ask you to give a Second Reading to-day, has already twice received your Lordships' approval, and is to-day precisely in the same form as when it passed this House last year. It is intended to deal with cases where the presentation to a benefice is vested in a large constituency: either a body of parishioners or other bodies, consisting of a large number of persons; and it proposes that the parishioners, or others, should exercise their right of presentation by electing a body of trustees which shall exercise the right for them when a vacancy occurs; it proposes also that the trustees shall be elected not at the

time of the vacancy but beforehand, in order to provide against some of the disorder and excitement that has found a place on occasions when the election is made by a large body of patrons. My Lords, the provisions of the Bill are perfectly simple, and I need not delay your Lordships by saying anything more about them. I now beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>."—(*The Lord Archbishop of York.*)

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND REPEAL BILL [H.L.]—(No. 25.)**

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, on the very first introduction of the Local Government Bill I laid a Bill on the Table of this House and required it to be read a first time, when the noble Marquess, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, got up and said that there was no instance of a Bill, that had been passed, being repealed in the same Session. I ventured to remind that Minister that the Jews' Naturalisation Bill was brought in by the Duke of Newcastle, when he was Prime Minister, and, at his request, was repealed in the same year. My Lords, I thought that would have entitled me to have my Bill printed. But, my Lords, things are carried with a high hand in this House, and the Clerks seem to think they may stop one on every occasion. Sir William Rose tried to stop me from endeavouring a second time to restore the Court of Common Pleas, but I was enabled to plead the cause of that important Court a second time. My Lords, I am not one who is easily discouraged. The reason why I have brought this measure forward to-day, and no sooner, is that the County Council was going on, and it would have been very insulting to that body if I had said anything to show a distrust of them; but, at the same time, I



must remind your Lordships how, both in London and in the country, the extravagance of these bodies has become almost intolerable. The London County Council only opposed, by a small minority, a proposal that all the expenses of pulling down half the Strand should fall upon the rates. Well, my Lords, an instance occurred to me only the other day. In passing from Derby to York, by the Great Northern Line, at West Derby I met a County Councillor, who told me that on that day they had agreed to pay very nearly £500 to a lecturer upon agriculture. Well, my Lords, in our little club at Bakewell we had lecturers upon agriculture, and we paid them ourselves. My Lords, the stress upon these rates is becoming quite intolerable. In the East part of London there was a dinner to help the rates in the expense of a library. The illustrious Duke, His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, was in the chair; Lord Randolph Churchill had a place reserved for him on the left of the chair, and the Duke of Argyll on the right; but, as those personages did not appear, I had to sit on the right hand of His Royal Highness and the Bishop of Bedford on his left. Well, my Lords, His Royal Highness, in course of conversation, said to me, "We are going too fast." This is indeed the fact. We are travelling at a most rapid rate. Bills are passed through Committees, and they come here, and nobody knows what is passed. I am an old man, and I can hardly expect that anybody will second this, to show the opinion that some may entertain of the expediency of a change. At Derby, when this Local Government Bill was first passed, the Clerk of the Peace told me that the provision for including £10 owners and £10 occupiers had driven the overseers almost mad. For this election they are trying to make up the list to-morrow, and the election is to take place on Saturday; but there is too small a body to do the business of the office. In our county, from the absence of Mr. Arkwright, the whole County Council had to be put off for a day. We magistrates are able and willing to do our duty. The noble Marquess at the head of the State had an opportunity of addressing the people of Derby—he

*Lord Denman*

was placed in what is called the Drill Hall—and his great object was to show how recent were the powers of the magistrates over finance. My Lords, their conduct is irreproachable; and Sir Henry Wilmot, who is an Alderman, as I believe they call him, said to me, "I wish you could do away with this Local Government Bill." My Lords, he said to me, "You will have the same working men put upon the County Council that you had before." But, my Lords, you must remember that "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety"; and, if you have 50 men to do the work of four or five as many, you are incurring a good deal of danger. And I do assure you that it is like reviving the triennial Parliament. This is a little Parliament that is to be elected this week if they possibly can. Many householders have told me how much they have been annoyed by being canvassed for the County Councils; ladies also have told me that they have been extremely annoyed by being pestered to vote for County Councils—they would wish to vote for Members of Parliament whom they know, but not for a small body taken to swamp those of gentle birth—Methodists and others who are to become and be agitators. My Lords, I was very glad that the right reverend Bishop was yesterday refused the power of having reporters in the County Council Committees on technical education, because, from experience, I have found that the Board of Guardians of Bakewell is utterly subverted by the reports, and the length of speeches occasionally; and I do believe that it would be far better not to make this technical education so elaborate, because you have no proof that you will succeed. My Lords, I suppose I shall not have any Teller in proposing the Second Reading of this Bill. If so, I shall go my way; but I shall feel certain that that which is so unsuitable to Scotland, and works so ill in England, will not be received as a panacea for Ireland when it comes forward in another place. My Lords, I trust you will not think me an agitator—I am far from it. I wish to see a land of settled government; it is—

"A land of just renown,  
Where freedom broadens slowly down  
From precedent to precedent."

And the verse before that is—

"It is a land which free men till,  
Which sober suited free men chose;  
And where, begirt by friends or foes,  
A man may speak the thing he will."

My Lords, that has not been my case—  
but I make no complaint.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read  
2."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

Motion objected to; and, on Question,  
resolved in the negative.

House adjourned at a quarter  
before Six o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday, 1st March, 1892.*

### PRIVATE BUSINESS.

#### SOUTHAMPTON DOCKS BILL.

(*by Order.*)

#### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

(3.6.) MR. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I will be as brief as is consistent with the interests of those I represent on this occasion. It is a Bill that seriously affects the interest of the town of Southampton, indeed I may say the County of Southampton, and especially it interests the railway and dock undertakings of the port. The proposal in the Bill is the sale of the property of the Dock Company to the South Western Railway Company, and I understand the opposition which emanates from the representatives of dock interests in the North of England rests on a question of principle, but of course it is easy to argue how a general principle does or does not apply to a particular case. The hon. Members who have given notice antagonistic to this Bill represent two Northern boroughs, and I cannot for the life of me see what they have to do with the arrangements of the Southampton Docks. The great dock interests of London have exhi-

bited no opposition; recognising this as a means by which the Southampton Dock Company can get out of its financial difficulties. It is not the Railway Company which is the principal promoter of this Bill. It is not in any sense from a desire to create a railway monopoly the Bill is promoted, it is the only feasible means for the Dock Company to relieve itself from serious and increasing depreciation. The Railway Company are holders of £50,000 4 per cent. mortgage debentures and £250,000 4 per cent. preference stock of the Dock Company, and at the same time they have advanced £30,000 by way of temporary loan, making a total of £330,000. They hold about a quarter of the whole property of the Company, and have therefore a large amount of power in the Company's affairs. A subscription of £250,000 was authorised for assistance in the construction of a new deep water dock. We have endeavoured, as far as possible, to keep pace with the demands of the times and the requirements of the port. We are on good terms with the Dock Companies on the Thames, and I cannot see why the North Country dockowners should oppose a Bill of such a reasonable character. The Railway Company has already a very large interest in the dock. The net revenue of the dock has declined during the last four years, and the opening of the new dock has not brought the increased traffic which was anticipated. The Company only paid 2 per cent. in 1891 on the 4 per cent. preference stock, and the revenue is still declining; and I may point out that a large portion of the stock is held by trustees for widows and children, and much is in the hands of working men. No dividend on the ordinary stock has been paid since 1890, when  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. was distributed among the shareholders. This movement was initiated by the shareholders, and not by the Railway Company. I may also mention the severe loss the docks suffered in 1873 by the withdrawal of the Peninsular and Oriental Company. We have attempted to make good this loss, but we have taken nothing, certainly, from the Northern Docks. We employ a large amount of labour, as the hon. Gentleman opposite, the

Member for Southampton, can tell you, and if the docks are closed, as, possibly, they might be if the money is not forthcoming, this important town and port of Southampton may be ruined, and the labourers there will be in a state of penury and destitution. I believe nearly every Railway Company in the Kingdom having coast communication has docks of its own; the Great Western and the North Western have docks, and the North Eastern has, or is endeavouring to secure, docks of its own. The London and Brighton Company has the port of Newhaven, and the South Eastern has docks of its own. Therefore, it seems to me very much like a dog-in-the-manger policy for these North Country docks to interfere in regard to what we are doing for the port and town of Southampton. I hope the Government will assist us in the endeavour to obtain a Second Reading of this Bill. It is a question of local interests and local self-government, and I hope those hon. Gentlemen who justify the principle of local self-government will support the Second Reading. There is no other principle involved here. In the circular sent round by our opponents—lukewarm opponents I hope I may call them—a lame pretext is put forward, and no strong argument against the Bill. They say that in 1872 there was a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament, which gave utterance to the assertion of a certain principle, or the expression of a sentiment, in regard to the amalgamation of Docks and Railway Companies. But, as hon. Gentlemen will understand, we have advanced and progressed since 1872, and principles that then held good are different from those which obtain to-day. To treat this as a matter of general public principle seems to me a most unnecessary interference with local interests. It is little to the interest of the Railway Company, though, of course, they would not undertake the purchase unless they found that the two undertakings could be worked better and more cheaply, with advantage to the interests of all parties concerned. Without going into the history of the docks, I may say they have made the most laborious endeavours to keep the docks up to the

requirements of the time. We are ready to receive the largest ships, and if the great Union Steamship Company, the Royal Mail Company, and others do not come to us, they certainly will not go to any of the ports represented in any way by the hon. Members for Whitehaven and South Shields. So I think their interference in our proposal is wholly uncalled for. At any rate, we are in an almost destitute condition. I might almost say we are pleading before the House *in forma pauperis* for the good of the property, for the good of the working classes of Southampton. I hope we shall have the support of the hon. Member for Poplar (Mr. Buxton), whom I see opposite, and others who interest themselves in labour questions. I think we ought to have the sympathy of those hon. Members who have in recollection the labour strikes at Southampton, and the position of working men there. We object to a Hybrid Committee, because reference to such a Committee must lead to a postponement of the carrying out of the proposal, and will entail much additional expense, which we are not able to bear. I do hope that the Government will justify their own principle of local self-government, and assist us in passing the Second Reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(Mr. Norris.)

(3.15.) MR. F. H. EVANS (Southampton): I rise to support the Motion for Second Reading. The Bill is introduced by the Southampton Docks Company, because that company finds itself in the position of having a very large accommodation for shipping and not the means and appliances sufficient to attract the larger shipping, and make the undertaking pay. The borrowing powers of the company are nearly exhausted, and the means of raising money gone. Capital is required to complete the finest docks in the Channel. The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken has pointed out that a large amount of labour has been expended to keep the docks open. I cannot go so far as he has gone in the apprehension of the danger of the docks being closed, and I think even if

Mr. Norris

the Bill were thrown out still we should find the Southampton Docks would be maintained; and I do not join in pleading *in forma pauperis*. The opposition to the Second Reading, so far as I can make out, is based on the general principle that Railway Companies should not be allowed to acquire docks. My own experience is that general principles exist in theory, and may be sustained so long as there is nothing to apply them to, but as soon as they are applied to individual instances, then general principles are likely to get more and more attenuated. If, in the present instance, the Dock Companies were opposed to the amalgamation, then there would be good reason for the House to hesitate before granting a Second Reading to the Bill, but that is not the case here. The Southampton Corporation have passed a resolution in favour of the Bill. The railway shareholders have passed a resolution in favour of the purchase, and the dock shareholders, by a very large majority, have agreed to the sale, and I do not see that opposition should come in on the ground of general principles to the carrying out of a measure which all parties are eager to have passed. I do not see on what principle the House should refuse a Second Reading to the Bill. It is not because the London and North Western do not happen to possess the Liverpool Docks. Surely hon. Members will not apply an analogy of that kind. It is not that the London and South Western Railway Company want to obtain possession to the exclusion of all other railway interests, for there are provisions to secure the public weal, so that the London and South Western Company will not obtain power of that kind. I agree with my hon. Friend that a Hybrid Committee will be an expensive solution of the difficulty. I prefer inquiry by an ordinary Select Committee, and I do hope that the House will, in the interest of the town of Southampton, which I represent, and in the interest of the Dock Company, which I also represent in this case, grant a Second Reading to the Bill to the advantage of all parties concerned.

(3.30.) THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. COURTNEY, Cornwall,

Bodmin): I rise thus early in the Debate to ask the House to consider the real point involved in this discussion, because the hon. Members who have spoken have shown considerable ingenuity in avoiding altogether what is the matter in dispute. We have had an interesting view of the force of general principles from the hon. Member who has just sat down, who seems to think they are only useful on platforms in view of elections, but are to be put aside when concrete cases present themselves for the application of those principles. There is no real objection to the Second Reading of the Bill, but there is involved a principle long recognised as beyond the immediate interest of a locality. We have a Standing Order of the House that in the case of any Bill which contemplates the acquisition of a dock by a Railway Company, that Bill shall not be referred to a Select Committee unless there is a special Report made thereon showing reasons for a departure from the general rule. That has been a Standing Order of the House for a long while. But a Joint Committee of the two Houses came to the conclusion that the Standing Order was not sufficiently strong, and that proposals of the kind, the acquisition of a dock by a Railway Company, and possibly the creation of a powerful monopoly, should be referred to a Hybrid Committee. Now, the question before the House is not really the acceptance or rejection of a Motion for Second Reading, but whether the Bill should be referred to an ordinary Select Committee of four Members, or whether it should go before a Hybrid Committee. Now, questions of general public interest cannot be sufficiently examined by an ordinary Select Committee, for no one appears before it to represent the wider interest beyond that of the locality, but before a Hybrid Committee there will be evidence and arguments on points affecting the general public interest, as well as the local interests. The hon. Member for Limehouse (Mr. Norris) has an apprehension that much more expense is involved in the examination by a Hybrid Committee, but I think he will find that examination before a Hybrid Committee is not much more, if at all more,

expensive than examination by a Select Committee of four Members. This would be an expensive business, looking to the character of the opposition raised, if all the Dock Companies who are endeavouring to maintain their independence in competition were represented, but I am assured that the opposition will be brought to a single representation, and there is no intention to go through the reduplication of evidence. I do not think, therefore, there will be much additional expense, and I should recommend that the Bill be read a second time, and referred to a Hybrid Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

MR. J. C. STEVENSON (South Shields): I beg to move the Motion standing in my name.

SIR JAMES BAIN (Whitehaven): I beg to second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee to consist of Seven Members, Four to be nominated by the House, and Three by the Committee of Selection."

(3.25.) MR. NORRIS: Of course, in face of the representations made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Committees, and understanding from him that this course will not lead to delay or great additional expense, I will, with the concurrence of the House, fall in with his view.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That all Petitions against the Bill presented three clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; and that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by their Counsel, Agents, or Witnesses, be heard on their Petitions if they think fit, and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against such Petitioners.

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

That Three be the quorum.

BELFAST CORPORATION (LUNATIC ASYLUMS, &c.) BILL—(by Order).

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [29th February]—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert in the Bill clauses re-arranging the existing division of the City of Belfast into wards, so as to make it possible for all classes of its inhabitants to obtain representation in the Town Council."—(Mr. Sexton.)

Mr. Courtney

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

(3.28.) MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Again I have to regret the absence of the Minister of the Crown responsible for Irish affairs on the discussion of this Irish question. I appeal to the House to adopt this very simple mode, strictly relevant to the Bill, of redressing a monstrous and undeniable grievance, the nature of which I can state in a very few words. The City of Belfast has, according to the last Census, a population of 273,055, governed by a Corporation consisting of 40 members. In that population is included 70,000 Catholics, who have no representation on the Corporation. It is obvious that, in a city with a population of 273,000 and 40 members of the Corporation, each member of the Corporation represents an average of 6,000 or 7,000, and yet this population of 70,000 Catholics—nearly a fourth of the whole population—is without a single representative among the 40 who control municipal affairs. This Catholic population live for the most part in one quarter of the city, and have a special interest in the paving, lighting, sanitation, and other details of municipal service. It is therefore necessary that they should be represented on the Local Council by men in sympathy with their views and on whom they can rely. Is it not discreditable to this House that a state of affairs should be allowed to continue in Belfast the like of which does not exist in any other city in the United Kingdom? What is the cause of the grievance? Simply this: that the wards of the city were fixed 40 years ago, and they have never been redistributed since. In 1853, when the population of Belfast was 115,000, the town was divided into five wards. Since then Belfast has become a city with 278,000 inhabitants; and yet, though the population has more than doubled, the division into five wards remains, with two Aldermen and six Councillors to each—a state of things to which no parallel can be found elsewhere. Now I am asking for nothing new. A Royal Commission was appointed by a Conservative Government in 1879 to consider this question. The Commission

took evidence on the spot, examined all the details exhaustively, and reported in 1881, eleven years ago. In this Report, the Commissioners recommended that the wards should be redistributed, and that instead of five there should be eight. The Corporation of Belfast, the promoters of this Bill, agreed that the wards should be re-adjusted, and that they should be eight in number, and it deserves to be noticed by the House that two other Municipal bodies, the Belfast Water Board and the Board of Guardians, submitted schemes in which they recommended that the five wards should be subdivided into 15. No one in Belfast then thought five wards sufficient, and yet here we are, in 1892, with the population of the city more than doubled since 1858, and still the division into five wards exists, with the anomalous and discreditable state of things that 70,000 inhabitants are left without a voice in the management of civic affairs. I have two reasons relevant to this Bill why the instruction I propose to give to the Committee should be granted. If I were asking anything irrelevant to the Bill, I should expect to meet with opposition, but I ask nothing beyond the scope of the Bill. The Corporation are asking for new powers of expenditure and control in regard to payments for children in industrial schools. I beg the House to observe that payments by Corporations in Ireland in this respect are optional. If payment were compulsory, I should have not a word to say—our endeavours would be directed to see that the Corporation did not evade the law; but a Corporation has a free choice in such matters as to when they shall pay anything and when they shall not pay anything. It should be further observed that the system of industrial schools in Ireland is denominational, every school being under Catholic or Protestant management, Catholic children being sent to the one class, Protestant to the other. Does any man expect me to admit that on a Corporation consisting of 40 members, on which the large minority of the Catholic population have no representation, due regard is had to the interest of Catholic children in those schools? I do not agree to anything of the kind,

and I tell the promoters of this Bill that unless they will agree that representatives of the minority shall be allowed some voice in the allocation of funds to the maintenance of Catholic children, this Bill will be met at every stage with the most stubborn opposition. In the towns of Dublin, Cork, and Limerick there is a Protestant minority not so large as is the Catholic minority in Belfast—not a fraction of it, and yet in Dublin, Cork, and Limerick the Protestant minority have on the Councils a proportion of representation far greater than their share of the population. I know from my own knowledge that in Dublin this is so, and in Cork and Limerick there is a decent liberality shown towards the minorities, while in Belfast a shameful intolerance excludes and outlaws a fourth of the population. We are not prepared to grant the powers sought in the Bill, unless this instruction is granted and acted upon. The Corporation also ask for a new franchise, and to this point I would beg the special attention of the Chairman of Committees. By Clause 4 of the Bill they ask power substantially to appoint a large majority of the Governors of the Lunatic Asylum. I do not care whether they have a virtual majority or not. Under the present system the proposition is this: that a purely Protestant body asks power to nominate the majority of the Governors of an asylum in which the ratepayers of all creeds are equally interested and concerned; and I who represent the Catholics in Belfast, we who represent the Catholics in Ireland, demand that the large proportion of our contributions towards the maintenance of these institutions should find some representation among the 40 Protestant gentlemen who are to direct the mode in which the asylums shall be conducted. This is a new Franchise Clause, and therefore my Instruction is strictly relevant to the question that the Committee should, in the way I think I have shown, take immediate steps to secure representation for the Catholics of the city on the Governing Body, should do what the Royal Commission recommended eleven years ago should be done, should sub-divide the wards into eight, ten, or fifteen, not allowing a state of things to con-

tinue which gives to each ward a population equal to an ordinary Parliamentary Division. I do not think any gentleman will get up and say that in any other city in the Kingdom in the present state of municipal representation such a state of things exists. What is the policy of the Government displayed in their Local Government Bill? They propose to establish the cumulative vote over the counties in Ireland. And for what purpose? For this and no other purpose to give the Protestant and Conservative minority in the country a voice, a share in the government, of their county or local and fiscal affairs. This I ask you to give in the City of Belfast.

MR. JACKSON: Not for the Protestant minority.

MR. SEXTON: I know that in three or four counties the Catholics are in the minority, but is this done for these minorities? Have the minorities in the four Eastern counties asked for it? They have not. Let no one tell me that the benevolence of the Government towards the Catholics of Ireland is of that voluntary character that they rush to the rescue of the Catholics in those four counties where they happen to be in a minority. No; the proposal is in the interest of the Protestant minorities in the 28 other counties. Therefore, the Government propose to establish cumulative voting to give the minority the chance of representation on the County Councils. Further, you propose to give to the Lord Lieutenant power to cut up each county into electoral divisions, so that by the system of cumulative voting the Protestant minorities may be enabled to secure representation. Do the same thing in the City of Belfast. Cut up the city into suitable and equitable divisions such as obtain in every other municipal town in the Kingdom, so that 70,000 of the inhabitants out of 270,000 may elect at least one representative to the Governing Body. Is that an excessive, an unreasonable demand? Can the Government resist it when their own suggestion for local government is cumulative voting and the power of the Lord Lieutenant to mark out electoral divisions, so that an insignificant and infinitesimal mino-

rity may find representation in counties? I shall not trouble the House further, only adding that if the mandatory terms of my instruction are open to objection, and this has been suggested to me, I am willing to conciliate opposition—though there is no conciliating opposition of a certain character in Belfast—I am willing to alter the terms of my Motion declaring that the Committee “have power,” so that a certain amount of discretion will be left to the Committee. Five years ago, when I urged an extension of the Municipal Franchise, I was bitterly opposed by the Corporation of Belfast in two Sessions. I was able to bring some leverage to bear then; the Corporation wanted a Private Bill, which the House refused to grant unless the Franchise Reform was granted, and it was granted. After fighting hard in this House for two years against this reform, the Corporation have ever since in Belfast pretended that they initiated the reform, and that I opposed it. I do not doubt, if the House passes this instruction, a similar result will follow, and the Corporation will claim credit for a reform as soon as it is granted, and which now they oppose. I earnestly appeal to every Member of the House to give his vote as the justice of the case requires.

\*(3.40.) SIR EDWARD HARLAND (Belfast, N.): I quite hoped on Friday, when at the suggestion of the Chief Secretary the consideration of this Bill was referred to a Hybrid Committee, all points raised might, by the Committee, be fully gone into. I regret that the hon. Member for West Belfast should have introduced the question of religion into this discussion. There is nothing in the Bill touching religious differences, and the introduction of religion into political matters creates a large amount of ill-feeling. Within the four corners of the Bill there is no reference to the re-division of the city into wards, but I may say that so far as the Corporation of Belfast is concerned there is not the slightest objection to the re-arrangement of the wards in number and area, but we maintain that the Bill does not deal with that matter, and if it is a thing to be done then it should be done by another Bill, or by means of the Bill dealing with

*Mr. Sexton*

the general question of Local Government, in which Clause 30 provides the procedure for dealing with such a question. It is not desirable to trammel this Bill with any such considerations, and a Committee upstairs has not the machinery for redistributing the city wards. For such a purpose a Commission should sit and take evidence on the spot, and consider the whole thing thoroughly, and probably, seeing that Belfast has increased so largely, it might also be necessary to enlarge the boundaries of the city. (Mr. SEXTON: No.) Certainly it would have to be considered. These are serious matters, not serious in the sense that there would be opposition, but requiring very careful consideration, particularly in view of the wishes of the hon. Member that the arrangement should be such as to give his immediate religious friends the opportunity of taking seats on the Council. As to the distribution of seats, what difference can it possibly make to Belfast? Has anyone ever drawn attention to mismanagement of municipal affairs there? I will undertake to say there is not a city in the three Kingdoms where municipal affairs are better managed than they are in Belfast, and no city shows a more healthy and prosperous condition of affairs. Why does the hon. Member seek to introduce into this matter the religious question? Refer to the origin and history of Belfast, and we find that Belfast is not an Irish town—really not an Irish town in the view of Irish towns held by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite. Trace its origin from the time when it ceased to be a country town, the centre for such industries as are connected with an agricultural district, and you find that the manufactures of various descriptions which were taken up were not established by manufacturers and workmen in Ireland, for they did not exist. The prosperity of Belfast took its rise from the energy and labour of Scotchmen and Englishmen. Three out of every four of the inhabitants of Belfast are of Scotch or English origin, and they are mostly Protestants. It is the jealousy of the Catholic element which seeks to over-ride the Protestant feeling of the city, and just as Belfast has

prospered under Protestant Government, so would it cease to prosper if Catholic methods of Government had predominance. No injustice is inflicted on the Catholic inhabitants; they pursue their industry under precisely the same conditions, so far as Local Government is concerned, as their Protestant neighbours; they have every consideration shown to them, and their children in industrial schools have exactly the same treatment as Protestant children in those schools. The hon. Member is raising an entirely false issue upon this Bill. We do not object to a revision of the city boundaries and wards, but we do submit that this is not the Bill by which this revision should be carried out. Let it be done either by means of the Local Government Bill or through a Special Commission, and do not hamper the Committee upstairs with matters it is scarcely possible they can deal with.

(3.47.) SIR JOSEPH McKENNA (Monaghan, S.): I hope the House has taken note of the objections offered to the Motion of the hon. Member for West Belfast, culminating in the statement that Belfast is not an Irish town. It is not, I think, the view that will generally be taken. Are we to have an *imperium in imperio* in Belfast? Is Belfast, with its 70,000 Catholic inhabitants, to be outside the principle that is embodied in the government of any other city in the Kingdom? I venture to say the House will never sanction such a theory as that put forward by the hon. Baronet. Have we not in our hands the Government Local Government Bill, in which the principles of Local Government are recognised, however the Bill falls short of our desires? And yet the Corporation of Belfast would take this city out of the provisions of that Bill. The hon. Baronet makes the astounding statement that Belfast is not an Irish town, and never have I heard a statement from a responsible Member of this House more calculated to sow widely abroad the seeds of discord and animosity. Unless some of the hon. Member's friends withdraw this opposition to the Instruction I hope we shall go to a Division, and that the



result will show the appreciation of the House of this attempt to force exceptional legislation for Belfast.

**\*(3.50.) MR. JOHNSTON** Belfast, S.): I support the opposition to the Instruction in the strongest possible manner. The introduction of the religious element into this discussion is due not to the promoters of the Bill, but to the hon. Member for West Belfast himself. The House must have taken note how from time to time, when measures for the promotion of the interests of Belfast have been brought forward, they have been met by persistent and consistent opposition from hon. Gentlemen opposite.

**MR. SEXTON:** As in the extension of the Franchise.

**\*MR. JOHNSTON:** This arises from jealousy of the progress and prosperity of Belfast, and because Belfast is pre-eminently and distinctly Protestant. The prosperity of Belfast is largely due to its Protestantism, and though hon. Members may laugh at the statement, it is borne out by such historians as Macaulay, who traces the prosperity of Ulster to Protestantism. In contradistinction to the rest of Ireland, Belfast has increased in prosperity and population, and it is the habit of the hon. Member for West Belfast to claim credit for action on behalf of Belfast in recent years. I do not know that he lays claim to any credit for the increase in population, but he does claim to have assisted towards the prosperity of the city. Belfast, I trust, will continue in a prosperous career. Belfast is distinctly and earnestly a portion of the United Kingdom, strongly opposed to the revolutionary projects of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and determined to remain an integral part of the United Kingdom. The Corporation of Belfast will always encourage liberty and fair play to the Roman Catholics in that city. The hon. Member has told us that there are three or four counties in Ulster where Roman Catholics are in the minority, but he indignantly disclaimed the idea that they claimed to be represented on the Local Government; he made no claim on their behalf.

**MR. SEXTON:** Nothing of the kind. The hon. Member is, as usual, inexact. I said they had not asked the Govern-

ment, and the cumulative vote had not been introduced in their interest, but in the interest of the minorities in the 28 other counties.

**\*MR. JOHNSTON:** The hon. Member comes forward as the champion of the minority in Belfast, but he repudiates the action of the Government with regard to minorities in other parts of Ireland. I trust the House will decisively reject the proposal now before us, and that we shall have the support of all Members who desire to see the integrity of the United Kingdom maintained. It is the fashion of hon. Gentlemen opposite to laugh at Protestantism—

**MR. MACNEILL:** No, no.

**\*MR. JOHNSTON:** The hon. Member for Donegal is himself the son of a Protestant clergyman.

**MR. MACNEILL:** I am glad to have been the son of a Protestant clergyman.

**\*MR. JOHNSTON:** I trust that the position taken by hon. Members opposite will be carefully regarded by the Protestants of Ulster. I hope the House will decisively reject the proposition before us.

**(3.57.) MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.):** On Friday the principle of this Bill was affirmed by only a small majority, and now the hon. Baronet (Sir E. Harland) has given away the principle on which opposition was raised to the present proposal, for he says the Belfast Corporation have no objection to the revision of the wards. But still opposition is made, not on the merits of the proposal, but founded on arguments of religion and race. The hon. Baronet, not being an Irishman himself, declares that Belfast is not an Irish town. But he lives in Ireland and he is "making his pile" in Ireland through Irish trade and energy. The hon. Member for South Belfast ascribes the prosperity of Belfast to its Protestantism. I am not one of those he accuses of laughing at Protestantism, and, for myself, I am a Protestant first and a politician afterwards. I claim to be as sound a Protestant as any Representative of Belfast, but I hate injustice, and I say it is a scandal to the Protestantism of Belfast that the Catholic citizens should be unjustly treated. The prosperity of

Belfast has been largely due to exceptional circumstances. It has been partly due to the bounty on the linen industry; it has been partly due to the long prevalence of the Ulster custom in the land tenure of the province, and there are other exceptional circumstances in addition to the undoubted energy of the Protestant population. There is no one prouder of the success and prosperity of Belfast than I am; but I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the Belfast people are ungenerous, illiberal, and prejudiced in the highest extreme. Belfast sends to this House Representatives as narrow as itself, and they tell you—"This is the great Belfast we are building." In their narrow self-importance the Protestants of Belfast refuse the least justice to their Catholic fellow-townsmen, though, I ask, what have they to fear? Why, Sir, they have everything to gain by giving this justice. If you in Belfast persist in acting in this illiberal manner you will create a force outside Belfast antagonistic to you. Where is the danger to the Belfast Protestants or their property in showing fair justice to the 70,000 Catholics in the city? Have the Catholics no interests, no property, no liberties to protect? Some of them are extremely wealthy, and are well known to the merchants of London and Liverpool, and yet not one of these men, who have helped to build up the prestige of Belfast, is admitted to the Municipal Council because he is a Catholic. Protestantism ought to be ashamed of itself in this matter. Could any fair representation of these 70,000 Catholics on the Council override the representation of the 200,000 Protestants, or injure their interests in any way? If I thought that Protestant interests, or property, or capital would be jeopardised by asking you to allow Catholic interests to be represented on the Council I would not support the proposition. But I have no fear on the matter. If it be right that the privileges of Catholics should be extended we should throw aside our race prejudices, our religious and political prejudices—be just and fear not, and allow this Instruction to be carried.

(4.10.) MR. T. LEA (Londonderry, S.): I am very sorry that the Catholics

are not represented on the Council, and I should be glad if they were. But why should Belfast be singled out for special treatment of this sort? If Manchester or Liverpool came before this House to ask for power to deal with their lunatic asylums, would anybody think of tacking on to their Bill a Parliamentary Instruction that they should enlarge their boundaries or change their wards? Belfast is singled out for this hostility because of the jealousy of hon. Members below the Gangway. It is a standing monument to the benefit of the Union, and, therefore, you propose to subject it to special treatment which no great city in England would submit to. Surely the Catholic inhabitants of Belfast vote now; they have equal voting power with the Protestants. I put this point strongly before the House: that Belfast ought not to be singled out for special treatment in this matter, but that the Bill should go before the Select Committee in the usual way.

(4.15.) MR. PICTON (Leicester): The hon. Member for Londonderry referred to Liverpool, and says that there is no reason to suppose that if Liverpool came for a similar measure you would treat it in the same way. The case of Liverpool is remarkably interesting. It is a larger town than Belfast, but the proportion of Catholics and Protestants is about the same, the former being about one-fourth of the inhabitants. Now, Sir, suppose that the ward arrangements were so jerry-mandered that the Catholics never had a single representative on the City Council. I am persuaded that the House would not permit any more duties to be thrown upon the Council till some reform was made. This country, Protestant as it is, would be ashamed to have a city like Liverpool so arranged as to carefully exclude from the City Council any representative of so large a proportion of the inhabitants. Anything which is wrong in England is wrong in Ireland, and ought to be remedied, and I think this is a very good time to deal with the matter, inasmuch as additional duties are to be thrown on the Council in which the Catholics have a large interest. I would appeal to the sense of fairness of hon. Gentlemen opposite.

and ask them to contrast the position of Belfast in the North of Ireland and Liverpool in Lancashire, and so let the two towns be on something of an equality. I earnestly hope that the Instruction will be carried.

(4.18.) MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Hon. Members do not oppose this Instruction on the question of principle, or the merits of the case, and it is evident that if the Instruction were carried, one or two sittings of the Committee would deal with it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite blamed the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) for referring to religious differences, but he is here to represent Belfast, and to look after the interests of the population of that city. We have a Catholic population of 70,000 not represented on the Council, and the Corporation is seeking an extension of powers on two questions in which the Catholics are deeply interested. There is the question of the industrial schools, in connection with which the question of religion may arise from time to time, and if the Council be an exclusively Protestant body the Catholics cannot expect fair-play and justice in the matter. It also applies in a more limited sense to the asylums. We contend that there is a public principle in this Bill, and that the promoters must be content to accept this Instruction, or to have the question treated on its merits publicly. On the Belfast Main Drainage Bill the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) raised the question of the municipal franchise, which was subsequently dealt with in a public manner, and the Public Bodies which were then opposed to his action have since thanked him for the course he took. In the City of Cork, with a municipal population of 80,000, there are seven wards; on the same basis Belfast ought to have 21 wards. If the Instruction be agreed to the Committee would be able to carry it into effect in one or two sittings, as there are already two or three schemes on the subject. The Royal Commission itself recommended the increase of the wards to 15. It is useless for hon. Members to say they are prepared to concede fair-play to the 70,000 Catholics

of Belfast if they oppose a reason proposition of this kind. I hope Members will allow the Instruction to pass, and no longer give an exhibit of illiberality and bigotry.

(4.23.) THE CHAIRMAN OF C MITTEES (Mr. COURTNEY, C wall, Bodmin): The hon. Member West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) calls attention to the fact that a quarter of population of that city is Roman Catholic, and that there is not a single Catholic member among the 40 sitting on the Council. I think, Sir, if that so, it is a very grave circumstance is a fact to be condemned; a fact to be remedied, as it shows that in the ministration of affairs in Belfast a considerable minority has no share. I do not think it follows that this evil will be best remedied by passing the Instruction proposed by the hon. Member appears to me that there are objections on two grounds. In the first place would throw on the Committee what he had to deal with the Instruction a very difficult task, which I do not know the Committee would be able to undertake, and I doubt very much whether, if they could carry out the Instruction, it would quite answer the aim which the hon. Member has in view. To give this Instruction to the Committee is to impose upon it a very difficult task of redistributing the area into wards, and certainly such a proposition would never be considered in spite of what has been said by the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) in reference to any English city. We have at the present time the Birmingham Water Bill before the House, and I wonder what would be thought of a proposition to re-consider, say, the Parliamentary representation of the city in connection with that Bill. The hon. Member says there are two important powers entrusted to Belfast by the Bill; so there is a new plan given by the Birmingham Bill. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Flynn) says that it would be easy for the Committee to carry out the Instruction, because there are three plans to select from. I think if there were only one plan it might be easy, but with three opposing plans the difficulty of the matter is increased.

*Mr. Picton*

MR. SEXTON : Does the right hon. Gentleman remember that the Royal Commission suggested a plan ?

MR. COURTNEY : Yes. The Commission suggested a plan, but it seems to have been so unfavourably received that the two Local Bodies proposed two other separate plans. All these plans are eleven years old, and the population of Belfast has grown considerably since then. I do not think it can be seriously suggested that this would be a convenient way to settle the question ; if it is to be done at all it should be done by a special Bill. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) has raised the question of the municipal franchise again and again on other Belfast Private Bills, and I also felt it to be my duty to oppose the principle then. There may be some ground for doing something, but I do not know whether if the city were divided into an additional number of wards the Catholics would get more representation on the Council. We have already had some experience, and it tends to negative the hope that there would be Catholic representation on the Corporation. I will point out to the hon. Member a simple way of securing his object. He can propose a simple clause, when the Bill comes down for report on Third Reading, requiring that in future municipal elections in Belfast the principle of cumulative voting shall be applied. He might then get full representation for the Catholics in a much simpler manner than would be the case under his present proposal.

(4.27.) MR. KNOX (Cavan, W.) : I venture to think that in one argument he used the right hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension as to the facts. He says if an English Bill were introduced, with the same object, the House would not listen to a proposal for a re-arrangement of the wards of an English city as part of the Bill. I agree with him, but why ? Because there is a special general provision in the Municipal Corporations Act for the re-distribution of the wards of English cities, under which a Commissioner is sent down by the Home Secretary ; he inquires into the circumstances, and divides the city into new wards. In Ireland there is no such provision, and

the only way we can get a re-distribution is to come to this House and insert a provision in a Private Bill. This, therefore, is not an unusual way ; as a matter of fact, it is the only way in which we can attempt to do it. The right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means seems to think that if minorities are not to be represented on Hare's system, they ought not to be represented at all. What the Irish Members want is that it should be done in the same simple and efficacious way such as is adopted in English towns. It would be quite easy to divide Belfast into wards, and there would be no necessity for going into lengthy details in a Bill ; it could be done by some impartial persons, such as the Ordnance Survey Commissioners named in the Bill. Let it be borne in mind that in this Bill it is proposed for the first time to give powers intimately connected with religion in Belfast to the Belfast Municipality. I think if you give these new powers you should at the same time provide for the representation of the religious minority.

(4.35.) MR. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.) : I know that Armagh and other towns in the North of Ireland are most anxious that their boundaries should be extended. What all the Irish Members are asking for is that this House should deal with Belfast as it deals with Birmingham and Liverpool and other English towns. The Presbyterian Body of Belfast are as much interested in this matter as the Catholics are, for they are almost in the same need of representation, so that this is a question which interests them quite as much as it interests the Roman Catholics. There are many of the divisions in Belfast where a Presbyterian has no chance of being returned to the Municipal Corporation, and the Presbyterian Body are, therefore, most intimately concerned in the question. This question of the representation of minorities is one which requires the serious attention of the House, and particularly as it affects the North of Ireland. I can speak for the City of Armagh, and I say that it is much required. In Belfast not only the Roman Catholic, but the Presbyterian is deprived of representation—

wholly and completely deprived of it, I might say; and we ask the House to remedy this disgraceful condition of affairs. I think the House should listen to the appeal that is being made to it, and that, at least, it should direct that there be some result for all the trouble and all the expense that has been gone to in giving evidence before the Municipal Boundary Commissioners.

(4.40.) MR. J. PINKERTON (Galway): I am compelled to say that this matter should not, in my opinion, be managed simply in accordance with the ideas that are so constantly promulgated in Orange Lodges; nor should it be managed in accordance with the ideas of a Tory Municipality. It is only right that the Government should express their intentions with regard to this matter, which I regard as one of great importance. We in the North of Ireland regard the question as one of vast importance, and we ask the House to interfere in relation to it. Why should not such a division of Belfast into wards be effected as would give the Catholic population at least a fair representation on the Municipal Corporation? Belfast occupies at present quite an exceptional position. The Tories there have, in fact, reduced intolerant practices to an exact science; they have crushed out the Presbyterian Body; they have crushed out the Catholic Body; they have managed to keep the representation to themselves, and not in Great Britain can you find a place in which there is such distinct exclusiveness exercised; no man who is not prepared to bow the knee to the Grand Lama of Toryism has, in fact, a chance of filling any office in Belfast. I hold that the opposition to the measure is fully justified, and that we are fully justified in fighting the matter, having regard to the importance of the question and the number of people who are interested in its solution.

(4.45.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I think the constituencies will have to consider whether it is for the advantage of the House that they should find themselves discussing Irish matters of purely local interest night after night. I think the proceedings to-night form an illustration of the method by which this

House deals with Irish affairs, but under the existing circumstances, the discussion could not be avoided. Still, it will be for the country to consider whether the system ought not to be changed. But the most appropriate course for dealing with a matter of this kind is not by Private Bill or by Resolution. Everybody, I suppose, admits that the present distribution of the wards in Belfast has caused great political and religious injustice in that city. Under the English Municipal Corporations Act there is a machinery for the re-distribution of wards where altered circumstances demand such a change; but in Ireland there is no such power under present conditions. You say that you are willing to extend equal justice to Ireland as to England. Why do you not do it? I say that if this power which exists in England be not extended to Ireland, the Government will be guilty of injustice to Ireland in spite of their protestations. I ask the Government, will they undertake to bring in a Bill for the purpose of dealing with this question; or will they undertake in some way to do what is necessary, so as to give Belfast the same rights and the same measure of justice as has been given to English cities under the Municipal Corporations Act? I do hope that the Government will take this matter in hand, and not leave it in the condition in which it is at present.

(4.53.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman has lost sight of two important matters. We are told that the grievance in Belfast is that the distribution of wards has been so designed that although one-fourth of the population is Catholic still the whole of the Municipal Corporation is Protestant, and that the Roman Catholics cannot get representation upon the Corporation. The House must not run away with the idea, as I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman would have it do, that such a grievance, be that grievance great or small, would be removed if we were to apply to Ireland the same legislation as exists in England. Let it be recollected that under the English Act, when there is a question affecting the distribution of

wards in towns, the Home Secretary has only power to move in the matter when two-thirds of the Town Council petition him to exercise his power. In a case like Belfast, where it is said the Council all take the one view, I ask, what probability is there that a two-thirds majority of the Council would petition the Home Secretary to take action in the matter? The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that the state of things which he describes as connected with Belfast is peculiar to Belfast, and to Belfast only. It is nothing of the kind. I understand that a Bill is shortly to be brought into the House to enable the wards in Liverpool to be re-distributed, the difference in the size of the wards being at present immense. But I am informed that the Home Rule Party in Liverpool made such strong resistance to the proposal that two-thirds of the Council should petition the Home Secretary to take action that it was absolutely impossible to set matters right in the manner proposed. The second point which the right hon. Gentleman has overlooked is not less interesting. The right hon. Gentleman appealed to the Government to bring in a Bill dealing with this question. Well, my reply is, that the Government have brought in a Bill to deal with it. If the right hon. Gentleman had only taken pains to read the Bill, which I confess he has spent a good deal of time in denouncing, if he had read through the clause of the Irish Local Government Bill—a Bill which could hardly be mentioned in his presence without moving him to indignation—he would have seen that the Government propose measures by means of which the re-distribution of Irish boundaries can be effected more easily than can those of wards in English towns at present. I think the Government is doing more than justice to Ireland by giving her a more complete method of dealing with this difficulty than any method possessed by the Municipal Corporations of England.

(4.57.) MR. H. H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I think when the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury talks of a remedy which will be applied to the grievances of Belfast under the Local Govern-

ment Bill, he refers to a very dim and distant future. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the case of Liverpool. I ask the House to say, if the grievance was felt as strongly in Liverpool as it is in Belfast, and if the Corporation of Liverpool were to come to this House for aid, would not the House take good care to give it? We have now an opportunity of remedying this grievance, a grievance which the right hon. Gentleman does not deny, and I ask the right hon. Gentleman why not therefore act at once? I admit that the way in which it is proposed to apply the remedy is not the best way; but let the Government propose a better plan, and we will accept it.

MR. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I think the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury affords the best justification for the Motion of the hon. Member for West Belfast. If the Government will not introduce a Bill to remove the grievance which is complained of, and will not allow this Instruction to go on the Minutes, because they have already provided a remedy for the grievance in the Irish Local Government Bill—if that Bill ever becomes law, and the probabilities are that it will not become law—in the meantime they get through this Bill increasing the powers of the Belfast Corporation. Therefore, they will increase their powers without removing the grievance which they admit. What I propose is that, if the Government are in earnest, they should postpone this Bill until after the passing of the Local Government Bill, if they are honest. If they are not honest, then I think it is the duty of this House to take such measures as are possible to prevent this Bill going any further.

\*(5.3.) MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has given Liverpool as an instance of the re-distribution of wards, and has stated that it was only the Home Rulers in Liverpool who were a stumbling-block in the way of the re-distribution of wards in Liverpool. ("Hear, hear.") I beg to tell the hon. Member who says "hear, hear!" and the right hon. Gentleman that that is not the case. Many years

before the Home Rule question became a burning question in Liverpool, or had a representation in the Town Council of that city, there were several motions for the re-distribution of the wards of that city, and they were always opposed by the Tory party, who held a monopoly of that city for over 50 years before, and tried so to jerrymander the re-distribution as to continue for 50 years more to be masters. The Liberal party of the city had increased up to the year 1882, and were nearly able to control the city by the election of Mayor; and it was only when the Tory party got alarmed in that way that they then put forward at that particular period a movement for the re-distribution of the city; because they wanted to incorporate with the city the suburbs, the snobocracy of the city, so that they might be able to make up for what they had lost in the central wards of the city, by re-distribution. I feel bound to say, in justice to the citizens of Liverpool that the religious question never entered into this dispute. The people have been generally willing to let the Catholics have a fair representation, although they are one-third of the city. I wish to refer to that part of the speech of the hon. Member for South Belfast where he said that Belfast disapproved of revolutionary projects. Well, it is something new to me to hear that Belfast and the North of Ireland disapproves of revolutionary projects. I thought that Belfast and the North of Ireland were supporters of the pretensions of the Duke of Cumberland to get on the Throne of England when all the rest of Ireland—

Mr. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to deny this accusation of treason.

Mr. P. O'BRIEN: Undoubtedly, if history is not altogether a lie, the Orangemen of Ireland did support the pretensions of the Duke of Cumberland to get on the Throne of England. There never was a revolution in Ireland that had not its headquarters and its best supporters in the North of Ireland. I wish also to refer to the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for North Belfast, which to my mind throws a flood of light on the proceedings of five or six years ago, namely,

*Mr. Patrick O'Brien*

the riots of Belfast on that occasion. We heard that out of the works on the Queen's Island, presided over by the hon. Baronet, men were allowed to carry out tons of nuts and bolt-heads in their pockets to fire at the heads of Catholics—(Cries of "Order, order!")

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question of the Belfast riots has nothing to do with the Bill before the House.

\*MR. P. O'BRIEN: I beg to withdraw the expression. I do hope the House will support the Motion of the hon. Member for West Belfast, and give the people a fair representation. I think it could be very easily done; and I think the Government should give us some assurance that if it cannot be done in this Bill they will use the powers they have to see that people get fair representation.

(5.6.) MR. NEVILLE (Liverpool, Exchange): As I understand, the Irish Representatives put before the House a grievance, which is fully admitted, with regard to the re-distribution of the wards of Belfast, and the Government have been already appealed to from the Front Opposition Bench as well as by Members below the Gangway, and they have refused to undertake to propose or support any measure of relief for the remedy of this grievance—("No, no!")

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have distinctly told the House that we have amply dealt with the subject in the Bill now before the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I should like to ask—"Order, order!"

MR. NEVILLE: Any special peculiar remedy with regard to Belfast. Now it has been pointed out that there is a Bill which is directed to the special remedy of a legitimate grievance in Liverpool—"No"—and I ask the House to pay attention to the attitude of the Government to-day, and to recollect it, and bear it in mind when that other Bill comes before the House; and I ask them to contrast the attitude of the Government to-day with what we on this side of the House know will be the attitude of the Government when this Bill relating to Liverpool, which is supported by the Liverpool Tories, comes to be dealt with.

(5.10.) SIR CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.): I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord has a very

imperfect acquaintance with the provisions of that great measure, the Local Government Bill for Ireland. He has assured the House that the Government, by that Bill, are going to provide a remedy for the state of things existing in Belfast; and I presume he refers to the 30th clause of that Bill. He cannot have read it, or he would not have misled the House; he would not have made that statement. The clause provides, that, "Whenever it is represented by the Council of any County, Borough, or Municipal Borough"—I omit the other words—then the proceedings may be taken. What remedy is that to begin with?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman allow me to interrupt him? I desired to reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby; and I said that while the English Act required two-thirds of the Council to take action, the Local Government Bill for Ireland only required a majority. And, therefore, my contention was that we had not only proposed to do all that had been done for England, but to do more than had been done for England.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL: I hope the supporters of the First Lord are content with that explanation. It seems to me to fall very far short of being a satisfactory one. The right hon. Gentleman made that statement in reply to my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, no doubt, but he went on to say—and I believe he was understood by the House to say—that in the measure which the Government were bringing forward they would provide a remedy for the case of Belfast. Now, we all know that it is not a question of the division of parties in the Council at Belfast, for they are all of the one political complexion; and, therefore, under this Local Government Bill, if it ever become law, the grievance would be as great as it is at the present moment, and this Bill would afford no adequate remedy whatever. I agree with my right hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton, that nobody can say this is the most convenient way of dealing with the question; but it is the only way we have, and cer-

tainly, having an opportunity of dealing with it, and of taking the expression of the opinion of the House upon it, we do not intend to lose that opportunity.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 172; Noes 195.—(Div. List, No. 13.)

## MOTIONS.

### THE ELECTRIC AND CABLE RAILWAY SCHEMES.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I rise to move the Resolution which stands in my name. There is no doubt at all that the result of the labours of the Joint Committee that sat in 1864 was to give London a perfect system of external communication. Numerous important schemes for electric and cable lines are now before Parliament, and if they are considered independently the result may be that London will be intersected by unnecessary and even conflicting lines, when what is wanted is a scheme as comprehensive and perfect as that of 1864. It is in the hope that that will be the outcome of the labours of a Joint Committee that I venture to move this Resolution.

\*MR. T. H. BOLTON (St. Pancras, N.): Sir, I rise to second the Motion. I brought forward a portion of this subject last Session in connection with a Bill for the construction of a tunnel railway from the City to the West End, and the question then raised was how far the people of London had some right to compensation for the interference with the subsoil of the streets. That is an important question, and will, I suppose, come before the Committee. There is the larger question as to the general arrangements with reference to these railways—the level, the sort of cuttings, the size, the direction they shall take, and the dealing with the subsoil of private property that they may disturb. The Reference to the Committee will probably cover all these questions, so that all the important subjects raised can be considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons be appointed to consider the best method of dealing with the Electric and Cable



Railway Schemes proposed to be sanctioned within the limits of the Metropolis by Bills introduced, or to be introduced, in the present Session, and to report their opinion as to whether underground Railways worked by electricity or cable traction are calculated to afford sufficient accommodation for the present and probable future traffic; as to whether any, and which, of the Schemes propose satisfactory lines of route; as to the terms and conditions under which the subsoil should be appropriated; whether any, and, if any, what Schemes should not be proceeded with during the present Session."—(*Mr. Whitmore.*)

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I rise to move, as an addition to the Resolution, to add after the word "Session" these words—

"And that such Committee have power to hear the parties promoting such Bill, and, if desired by them, receive evidence thereon."

Sir, in moving this addition I desire to say that I quite concur in the object of the Resolution moved by my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea, and all I wish is to give power to the Committee to hear parties and witnesses before pronouncing any judgment which might arrest the progress of many valuable schemes. There are already lodged no fewer than seven Bills of which this Committee would, doubtless, take cognizance and examine into, in order to test the principles which they may lay down for the guidance of Parliament. But it would be most unfair to those who have come to this House with their Bills, having incurred great expense and expecting that their Bills would be considered in the usual way by a Select Committee—I say it would be most unfair to these parties if, without calling upon them to show cause, the Joint Committee were to report that these schemes should not be proceeded with. I therefore move my Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words, "and that such Committee have power to hear the parties promoting such Bills, and, if desired by them, receive evidence thereon."—(*Mr. Kimber.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. COURTNEY: Sir, I hope the hon. Member will consent to the withdrawal of these words for the present. There is a great deal in what he said that is, in my opinion, of a decisive character. It would be very unfair that the Joint Committee should express

an opinion upon a particular scheme without hearing from the promoter whether it is part of a general scheme or what were its merits. However, I will not enter into those points. I only rose to ask the hon. Member not in the meantime to press the words, which have not been under the consideration of the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees in the other House, but to allow the Resolution to pass in its original form; and if he does that, I will take care that the words are brought under the notice of the noble Lord and of the Joint Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

\*MR. ISAACS (Walworth): I entirely agree with the hon. Member for Chelsea; but with reference to the Report of this Joint Committee, I think it should be understood that there should in the matter of these electric railways be no such result from the Committee as that resulting from the Committee which sat in 1864. It is very much the habit of Parliament to lay down rules as regards Metropolitan and other Railways, and to let people to believe, when assenting to these schemes, that they will not sanction any competitive lines. In 1864 the Committee laid it down that the great trunk thoroughfares, such as Oxford Street and Uxbridge Road, should not be interfered with in any way for the formation of railway lines. Nineteen millions of money have been spent in underground railways in London under the impression that Parliament, having imposed that condition, would not in any subsequent period have allowed these thoroughfares, which the promoters I allude to were precluded from touching, to be interfered with. Notwithstanding, however, the Report of the Joint Committee in 1864, Parliament last year sanctioned the Central London Railway Bill for a line of rail from Shepherd's Bush to the City. Looking to the fact that for railway enterprises money must necessarily be largely subscribed, it would be well to bear in mind, when laying down any special rules for lines of railway that people who promote schemes expect when the routes are once filled

they will not be interfered with by competing line.

main Question put, and agreed to.

resolved, That a Joint Committee of Lords Commons be appointed to consider the method of dealing with the Electric and Railway Schemes proposed to be sanctioned within the limits of the Metropolis by introduced, or to be introduced, in the next Session, and to report their opinion whether underground Railways worked by electricity or cable traction are calculated to afford sufficient accommodation for the present and probable future traffic; as to any, and which, of the Schemes proposed satisfactory lines of route; as to the conditions under which the subsoil should be appropriated; whether any, and, if what Schemes should not be proceeded during the present Session.

ordered, That a Message be sent to Lords to communicate this Resolution and desire their concurrence.

#### NEW WRITS ISSUED.

County of Wexford (Northern Division), *v.* John E. Redmond, Esq., or of Northstead.—(*Sir Thomas Meade.*)

Borough of Belfast (East Division), *v.* Edward Samuel Wesley Hobain, Esq., expelled this House. (*r. Akers-Douglas.*)

#### POOR LAW (IRELAND) RELIEF.

ordered for—

return showing, as regards each Poor Law Union in Ireland, the number of Persons of each sex of 65 years of age and upwards, and the number under 65 years of age who have attained 50 years of age, and the number of Children under 16 years of age, in receipt from Boards of Guardians of Indoor Relief or Outdoor Relief respectively, during the twelve months ending at Lady Day, 1892.—(*Mr. Mahony.*)

**MR. BITCHIE:** I think the hon. Gentleman has put down a Motion for a return in the same language as the return I moved for England. We are considering an alteration with the view of getting a little more information, perhaps the hon. Gentleman will postpone his Motion for a day or two, so that we may have the English and Irish Returns uniform.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### QUESTIONS.

##### SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL GRANTS.

**MR. MACLURE** (Lancashire, S.E., Stretford): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, in view of the fact that in many districts the fee grant of 10s. per head on average attendance, conceded by the Assisted Education Act of 1891, does not equal the fees paid before the passing of the Act, and as it is impossible to free all the schools in such districts without inflicting great hardship upon their managers and supporters, the Government will bring in a Bill to enable County Councils to supplement the new fee grant by a sum equal to the difference between the grant and the average fee paid in the district under its jurisdiction during the last school year ended the 1st of January, 1891, provided that in all schools receiving such supplementary grant the fees shall be either abolished or reduced by the amount of the said grant?

**THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL** (*Sir W. HART DYKE, Kent, Dartford*): It was not the intention of the Elementary Education Act, 1891, to abolish the payment of fees in all classes of schools, and, as at present advised, I fear I cannot undertake the introduction of a Bill for the objects suggested in the question of my hon. Friend.

##### TORPEDO VESSELS.

**MR. GOURLEY** (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has, or whether he intends organising in detail, a plan of campaign for the various types of ships comprising the squadrons of the Navy; if so, has he considered the part likely to be demanded of vessels of the torpedo class; and whether he is aware that Foreign Maritime Powers attach more importance to this description of naval warfare than the British Admiralty; the French Minister of Marine having provided France with 184, and the Italian Minister of Marine Italy with 123 torpedo vessels, as against 85 now in the British Navy?

**THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY** (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing) : The subject mentioned in the first sentence of the question has received all the attention which its importance deserves, and the employment of all classes of ships likely to be used in war has, of course, not been omitted from the consideration of the Admiralty. We have no reason to suppose that any Foreign Naval Power attaches more importance than we do to any description of naval warfare ; but it is quite likely that Continental Powers are alive to the policy of employing the methods best adapted to their own peculiar circumstances, instead of copying those suited to other countries, of which the maritime conditions are different.

#### THE AUTUMN MILITARY MANŒUVRES.

**MR. GOURLEY** : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, during the Autumn Manœuvres of the troops quartered at Aldershot and elsewhere, His Royal Highness the Commander in Chief attended and superintended the operations ; and whether he intends issuing an official Report of the Manœuvres similar to that of the Admiralty regarding the Naval Manœuvres ?

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR** (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle) : There have not been Autumn Manœuvres for several years ; but there have been at Aldershot and in other commands exercises in the field of troops stationed there. These were under the respective Generals commanding, who reported for His Royal Highness's information. Such drills were not analogous to the Naval Manœuvres, and it is not intended to publish a Report upon them.

#### THE ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF MILITIA AND VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY.

**COLONEL HILL** (Bristol, South) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that officers of Militia Artillery attending a class of instruction in coast defence and range finding at Devonport receive pay and allowances amounting for the week to about £9 for majors, £8 for captains, and £7 for lieutenants, while officers of

Volunteer Artillery of all ranks receive only about £3 for attending the course ; and, whether, viewing the importance of inducing officers of Volunteers to make the sacrifice of time necessary to obtain this instruction will encourage them by placing them upon the same terms as officers of Militia ?

**MR. E. STANHOPE** : The reason for the difference pointed out by gallant Friend is that Militia officers when at training are entitled to the same pay and allowances, rank for rank, as officers of the Regular Army, whereas officers of the Volunteers, longing to a force whose proud distinction is to serve without pay during peace, are only granted an allowance for subsistence and lodging.

#### THE LIMERICK BOARD OF FISHERY CONSERVATORS.

**MR. MAHONY** (Meath, N.) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the election of conservators to the Limerick Board of Fishery Conservators in the districts of Limerick and Athlone has been declared by the Court of Queen's Bench null and void ; and, if so, whether he can state when it is intended to hold a new election ?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND** (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.) : I understand that the arguments in the Court of Queen's Bench in this case are not yet closed, and therefore I cannot express any opinion in the matter.

**MR. MAHONY** : Can you state when the arguments are likely to be closed ?

**MR. JACKSON** : No, Sir.

#### POSTMEN — STAMPERS AND BOX-CLEARERS.

**MR. SEALE-HAYNE** (Devon, A. burton) : I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether it is true that the postmen engaged as stampers have an allowance of 2s. per week in lieu of Christmas boxes ; and, if so, why the postmen engaged in box-clearing are not entitled to a similar allowance ?

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Manchester, N.E.): Town postmen employed upon stamping duties receive an extra allowance in addition to their wages, because their work is regarded as superior in some respects to ordinary postmen's work, and the men employed on it have to be selected from the postmen's class for steadiness and good conduct. As such men would sometimes lose pecuniarily by not performing the outdoor delivery duty, it is thought right for this reason, as well as on account of the better nature of the work, to give them some extra weekly payment. This varies from 2s. in the smaller offices to 3s. and 4s. in the larger. Box-clearing is an elementary, duty which is usually performed by the junior postmen before they obtain a regular walk. No selection is required for this duty, and it is certainly not necessary to pay the men anything extra for doing it.

#### THE ROYAL NAVAL ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS.

**MR. LLEWELLYN** (Somerset, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in consequence of the disbanding of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, the officers will be permitted to retire with their present rank, and to wear the uniform of the corps to which they belonged?

**LORD GEORGE HAMILTON**: I am unable to give at present a definite reply to the question of the hon. Gentleman, as the final arrangements for the disbanding of the corps and the future disposition of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers have not yet been made, but the matter will receive the careful consideration of the Admiralty.

#### TRAWLING IN IRELAND.

**COLONEL NOLAN** (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the practice relating to trawling in Ireland is totally the opposite to that of Scotland, England, and France; if he would state by whose authority in Ireland a fishing policy opposed to the practice of Scotland, England, and France is maintained; by whom is the Fishery Board

in Ireland appointed, and by whom is the Privy Council appointed, and, if there is any elected body which has any voice on sea-fishery matters in Ireland?

**MR. JACKSON**: I have no official information in regard to the practice relating to trawling pursued in Scotland, England, and France. The fishing policy in Ireland is determined by the common law, and by special Acts of Parliament. The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. Privy Councillors in Ireland are appointed under the Sign Manual of the Queen. No elected body in Ireland has a voice in sea-fishery matters save as regards salmon and sea trout; but all bye-laws made by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries are subject to an appeal to the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council, by any person interested, before such bye-laws can come into operation.

**COLONEL NOLAN**: Is it not part of the duty of the Fishery Board in Ireland to make itself acquainted with the fishing law of other countries?

**MR. JACKSON**: The first duty of the Fishery Board is, I apprehend, to carry out the law.

**COLONEL NOLAN**: Is it not part of any person's duty—the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, or the Fishery Commissioners—to ascertain the practice of any other countries; and can no official of the Irish Government give us any information?

**MR. JACKSON**: I have no doubt the Fishery Board have a profound knowledge of what the law is with regard to Scotland, and England, and France; but their first duty is to administer the law.

**COLONEL NOLAN**: The object of the Irish Fishery Board is to know, and to be able to say whether the Irish policy is in line with that of other countries or not.

**MR. JACKSON**: No, Sir; I think not.

#### THE RIVER BANN.

**MR. PINKERTON** (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session for the

purpose of enabling them to remove the artificial obstructions placed upon the River Bann?

MR. JACKSON: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this question. I have to say that the Government hope to introduce this Session a Bill dealing with the drainage of the river mentioned.

MR. PINKERTON: Is it the intention of the Government to extend to the proposed County Councils in Ireland power to deal with the question of drainage?

MR. JACKSON: If the hon. Member will read the Local Government Bill he will see what the Government propose to do.

GREEN STREET COURTHOUSE,  
DUBLIN.

MR. KILBRIDE (on behalf of Mr. M. J. KENNY, Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if it has been arranged that the Commission of Oyer and Terminer and General Gaol Delivery hitherto held in the Green Street Courthouse, Dublin, will in future be held in the Four Courts; if the criminal and civil business of the Recorder of the City of Dublin is to be discharged as heretofore at Green Street; whether Mr. W. Kaye Perry, C.E., has reported to the Lord Chief Justice that Green Street Courthouse is unfit for human occupation; and whether the Irish Government refuse to do anything to replace the present Courthouse unless there is a local contribution of two-thirds of the total amount of the estimated cost?

MR. JACKSON: No general arrangement of the nature indicated in the first paragraph has been come to; but it has been decided to hold the next Commission sitting at the Four Courts. This decision does not include the business of the Recorder. Mr. Kaye Perry has, I understand, reported to the effect indicated. It is not the fact that the Irish Government refused to do anything to replace the present Courthouse. As I have already stated, they are willing to ask the Treasury to revive the charge sanctioned in 1883, which was accepted at that time as satisfactory by all

parties concerned, but from which the Corporation of Dublin subsequently withdrew.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Would the Irish Government facilitate by restoring the Lord Mayor to the Commission of Oyer and Terminer? If not, what reason have they for refusing to do so?

MR. JACKSON: I can hardly suppose that, in a matter of such vital consequence as I understand the health of those who attend these Courts to be, the Corporation of Dublin would allow any mere matter of sentiment to stand in the way.

MR. SEXTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider it of vital consequence to maintain a wanton insult?

MR. JACKSON: No, Sir.

THE GARVE AND ULLAPOOL  
RAILWAY.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate why the negotiations which took place last year between the Government and the Garve and Ullapool and Great North of Scotland Railway Companies, with regard to a subsidy of £6,000 a year for 25 years in aid of constructing the Garve and Ullapool Railway, have not been completed; whether he is aware that if the offer of these companies had been accepted the railway might now have been in course of construction; and whether he is aware that no other railway line can be sanctioned by Parliament earlier than the end of the Session in 1893?

MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is now prepared to lay upon the Table the Report of the Committee of Experts on the requirements of certain parts of the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and to intimate the intentions of the Government thereon?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I propose to answer at the same time the question put by the hon. Member for Inverness-shire. It was found in the course of the negotiations referred to that the proposed arrangement with the Great North Company was attended with difficulties

*Mr. Pinkerton*

which a solution could not be found. Departmental Committee of Experts appointed at that time to report specially on the schemes projected for construction of railways to the West Coast of Scotland. Their Report, which raises many important points, is being carefully considered, and it is proposed to lay it at once on the Table of the House, together with the instructions to that Committee. I am aware of no line other than that referred to now be sanctioned this Session by way of private legislation.

#### **THE MILITARY FORCES IN BURMA**

**MR. BUCHANAN** (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the statements of Lord Roberts at Rangoon, in the *Times* of the 26th instant, in which he urges strongly that the Military Forces in Burma should be immediately removed from the Madras Command, and placed directly under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief in India; whether this opinion is shared by the chief Civil and Military Authorities in India; and whether, in pursuance of his statement in the Debate of 17th February, 1891, on the Indian Confidential Commands, Her Majesty's Government will proceed, at an early date, to carry out this re-organisation of command suggested by the Commander-in-Chief?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: This is a question which should be answered by the War Office. I am afraid I cannot answer it. I do not see my hon. Friend the Under Secretary for India present, but perhaps the hon. Gentleman will repeat the question at another time.

#### **LABOURERS' WAGES AT THE WOOLWICH ARSENAL.**

**MR. MATHER** (Lancashire, S.E., Division): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that 697 labourers employed at the Woolwich Arsenal are receiving only from 17s. to 18s. per week, and that according to recently-published statistics, notably by Mr. Charles Booth in his work on *Labour and Life*, it is impossible in a manufacturing town for a thrifty man to maintain a moderate family,

even under conditions of privation, on less than 20s. per week, he will give instructions that the minimum rate of labourers' wages shall be 20s. per week, whatever may be the nature of the employment; and whether he is aware that where such minimum rate is fixed it has proved to be conducive to the interests of employers?

The hon. Member had also on the Paper a question—To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that 215 labourers employed in the Naval Ordnance Department at the Woolwich Arsenal are receiving only from 17s. to 19s. per week, and that, according to recently-published statistics, notably by Mr. Charles Booth in his work on *Labour and Life*, it is impossible in a manufacturing town for a thrifty man to maintain a moderate family, even under conditions of privation, on less than 20s. per week, he will give instructions that the minimum rate of labourers' wages shall be 20s. per week, whatever may be the nature of the employment; and whether he is aware that where such minimum rate is fixed it has proved to be conducive to the interests of employers?

**\*MR. E. STANHOPE**: The question addressed to me, and the next one addressed in the same terms to my noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, can be conveniently dealt with together. The position of these labourers was carefully considered last year, and the proportion on the lower rate of wages was reduced; but to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member would be to depart entirely from the decision deliberately arrived at, nor do we think it would be conducive to the interests of employers to do so.

**MR. MATHER**: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the evidence before him from a private communication I made to him is not a sufficient ground to warrant further investigation so as to ascertain whether the rate of wages paid to these men in the Arsenal cannot be made equal, at least, to that which prevails in like industries conducted by private firms?

**MR. E. STANHOPE**: I am much obliged to the hon. Member for the information he gave me; but I am afraid we could not undertake, on the

part of the Government, to pay wages to the same extent as are paid by certain private employers.

#### BERE ISLAND.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the importance of Bere Island as a fishing station, and also of the frequent visits of Her Majesty's Fleet to that part of Bantry Bay, he will increase the collection and delivery of letters from three to six days a week?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The receipts for this service do not at present cover the cost, and cannot, therefore, afford that it should be doubled.

#### TRIPPAGE ALLOWANCES WITH MAILS.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether any, and, if so, what, re-arrangement has been made or proposed with reference to the trippage allowances of officers travelling in charge of the mails from England to Ireland and *vice versa*; will he explain why these officers, who have taken up this service in the confidence that what was always done would be continued (namely, that they would be left in receipt of their allowances during good behaviour, or until they received more remunerative promotion, and would be pensioned on them), have been now informed that they must rotate with others, and so, comparatively speaking, lose both these privileges without any compensation of any kind; and whether these officers have also similarly suffered from a revision of the Sorting Office in Dublin, which is their head quarters; and, if so, to what extent and how often this latter office has been revised?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: No re-arrangement has been made of the allowances in question, nor I believe is any at present contemplated. If any new scheme were proposed long-established interests would be considered. There have been revisions of the Sorting Office in Dublin, and, as a result, the superintending force has been aug-

mented and the pay of a large sex increased; but, on the other hand, certain appointments and scales of have been abolished, and will c with the present holders. To extent, the sorters on board the pac and others of like rank have suff in prospect by the revision. I be that the augmentations I have tioned will more than compensate the abolitions.

#### THE CASE OF MATTHEW KINSELLA

MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.): I to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lieutenant of Ireland, with refer to Matthew Kinsella, of Dublin, was, in the year 1882, sentenced to years' penal servitude for shooting killing one Peter Andrews, whethe attention has been called to a decision, dated 25th February, 1892, made by deceased's father, Edw Andrews, of Meath Street, Du before Mr. Fry, J.P., in which declares that Kinsella and his deceased son had been friends and compared from their boyhood; that they had a quarrel; that the shooting purely an accident; that Kinsella tried and convicted in a time of passion and that, if he had been allowed to evidence, he could have explained satisfactorily how the unfortunate accident occurred; and, whether, considering the circumstances of the case, and that Kinsella has been in gaol ten years, he will make inquiry to if he can advise the remission of remainder of his sentence?

MR. JACKSON: I duly received declaration referred to, which forwarded to me by the hon. Member. The case of the convict mentioned has been already under consideration of successive Lords Lieutenant in connection with memorials submitted on behalf of the convict. They satisfied themselves that there was not the slightest doubt as to the man's guilt, that there was no mitigating circumstance, that the law must take its course. In regards the concluding paragraph may point out that the Chief Secretary does not advise the Lord Lieutenant to exercise the Royal clemency.

*Mr. E. Stanhope*

# THE MAILS TO THE CUSHENDUN DISTRICT.

**MR. SEXTON** (on behalf of Mr. T. M. HEALY, Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether complaints have arisen that Glasgow letters do not reach the Cushendun district, County Antrim, for two days after they are posted through failure to catch the 6.15 a.m. train from Belfast to Larne with which alone the daily mail-car connects, although passengers from Glasgow are almost invariably able to catch this train; and as there is considerable intercommunication between Glasgow and this portion of Antrim, will he take steps to ensure a regular daily delivery of the Scotch post?

\***SIR JAMES FERGUSSON**: It is unfortunately the case that the correspondence referred to frequently misses the early train from Belfast to Larne, in connection with which the Postal Service to Cushendun is maintained. There is said to be some difficulty in providing a remedy for this irregularity, but the matter is now under inquiry, and I shall certainly endeavour to have it rectified.

# THE SURVIVORS OF BALACLAVA.

**MR. FLYNN** (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in reference to statements in the *Sunday Chronicle* (Manchester) newspaper, concerning the survivors of the Balacava Six Hundred, whether all of the surviving commissioned officers, or a large majority of them, are in receipt of a Government pension; and, if so, will the War Office order any inquiry into the present position of the non-commissioned officers and men who are alleged to be in a state of destitution?

\***MR. E. STANHOPE**: The hon. Member seems to be under a misapprehension as to the conditions upon which the retired pay to officers and the pensions to non-commissioned officers and men are granted. Neither is given in respect of any particular act or campaign, except in the cases of wounds or broken health, but they are given as a reward for long and faithful service. If, therefore, officers have completed the period of service entitling them to retired pay, they, like soldiers in similar circum-

stances, will be in receipt of such pay. Otherwise, again, like the soldiers, they will not.

# THE CIVIL SERVICE BANK.

**MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been called to the prospectus of the "Civil Service Bank (Limited)," from which it appears that several Clerks in Government Offices are Directors of the said Company; and if this is in accordance with the Rules of the Civil Service?

\***SIR JOHN GORST**: My attention has been called to the prospectus in question. The names of the Directors appear to be generally those of Civil servants, with the names of their Departments added. The Rule of the Civil Service is as follows:—

"No officer shall be allowed to accept any part in the management of any society or any trading, commercial or financial company of whatever description which would require the attendance of such officer at any time between the hours of 10 a.m. and 6 p.m.;"

but if, as in the present case, members of the Civil Service use the credit of their official position to carry on such a business as banking, which can hardly be efficiently conducted by attendance after 6 p.m., the necessity for making rules of a more stringent character will have to be seriously considered by Her Majesty's Government.

# THE STAFF OF PORTLAND PRISON.

**MR. LABOUCHERE**: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received a memorial from the staff of the Portland Prison, which was presented to the Governor for transmission to the Home Office; whether the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Prison Officers' grievances recommended the promotion of assistant warders to the pay and rank of warders after ten years' service, but in the case of all assistant warders of longer standing recommended a delay of one year before the commencement of such increase of pay; and whether it is intended to act on this latter recommendation; and whether a similar method has been recommended in reference to the increase of pay of the officers of the civil guard?



\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.): The memorial referred to has been received. The Committee did not make the recommendation alleged in the second paragraph of the question. As I informed the hon. Baronet the Member for Barnard Castle Division (Sir Joseph Pease) last week, I have made an addition to the maximum rates of pay of assistant warders, and also to the maximum pay of officers of the civil guard.

**BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY AND MOMBASA RAILWAY SURVEY.**

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that Limited Liability Companies enjoying a Royal charter are freed from the obligation of depositing at the end of each year a list of their shareholders at Somerset House, which is open to the inspection of all, and to the statement contained in the letter written by Sir Philip Currie, and by direction of Lord Salisbury, to the Lords of the Treasury, dated 20th December, 1890, that—

"It is notorious that the majority of, if not all, the subscribers (to the company) are actuated rather by philanthropic motives than by receiving any adequate return on their capital,"

he will lay upon the Table of the House a list of the first subscribers to the capital of the Company; the amount of shares subscribed by each; all subsequent transfers; and a list of the present shareholders, with the amount of shares held by each shareholder; and whether, in view of the fact that it is proposed that the State should enter into a partnership with the Company in respect to a railroad, he will lay upon the Table of the House the annual balance sheets of the Company since its formation, showing the amount expended each year, the gross receipts, and the net profit or loss on the transactions of the year; together with the names of the Directors of the Company, and the amounts received each year by them in fees, salaries, or otherwise?

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): Chartered Companies are exempted from the requirements of the Limited Liability Companies' Act in the respect indicated by the hon. Member; but he invites Her Majesty's Government to place this Chartered Company in the same position as a company under the Limited Liability Companies' Act. Her Majesty's Government cannot take the course indicated, nor have they the information necessary to enable them to lay the Papers desired. The Imperial British East Africa Company are, however, prepared, I am informed, to give all the information asked for, if the hon. Member will call at the office of the Company, No. 2, Pall Mall East. As to the second paragraph of the hon. Member's question, Her Majesty's Government will, when the question arises, undoubtedly undertake to satisfy the House of the financial stability of this Company, or of any other with whom Her Majesty's Government may enter into any future arrangement for the execution and completion of the railway if it is undertaken.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I should like to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs precisely the information I am to receive at No. 2, Pall Mall East, if I call. I should like to know if I shall receive a list of the shareholders, in addition to a list of the original shareholders, together with all transfers that may have taken place since the formation of the Company. I would further ask what information Lord Salisbury was in possession of when he said that it was notorious that the majority, if not all, of the subscribers to the Company were actuated rather by philanthropic motives than the receiving of any adequate return for capital. I would further ask if I am to understand that when we are asked to endorse the action of Lord Salisbury we are not to have it made known to us who these philanthropists are to whom Lord Salisbury referred?

**\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER:** As to the first question, I think the answer will be best obtained if the hon. Member will call at the office. I am informed that the British East Africa Company are prepared to give all the information for which he has asked in the question put down on the Paper. With regard to the second question, the same sources of information were open to Lord Salisbury when he made the statement referred to as are, and were, open to the hon. Member. With regard to the third question, the matter seems one rather of argument, and therefore I do not think I should be in order in referring to it.

**Mr. LABOUCHERE:** Will not the hon. Gentleman give to this House the list of shareholders, which I gather from his answer was in the hands of Lord Salisbury when he made this extraordinary statement?

**\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER:** No, Sir; I have told the hon. Member that the information is not in the possession of the Foreign Office. As the hon. Member is aware, the names of the promoters of the Chartered Company have already been made public, and are to be found in the Blue Book, Africa, 1888, No. 10, I think.

#### THE ROYAL NAVAL ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS OF HASTINGS.

**SIR H. FLETCHER** (on behalf of Mr. NOBLE, Hastings): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will take into consideration the unfavourable position of Hastings as a station for a corps of Submarine Miners, and allow the Hastings corps of the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers to be absorbed into a fortress company of the Royal Engineer Volunteers, as a special case, instead of into a submarine mining company?

**Mr. E. STANHOPE:** There are difficulties in the case of Hastings, as we do not want submarine miners there, and there are already three companies of Artillery connected with the town. I will make further inquiries as to the possibility of utilising this corps of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers there.

#### THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACTS AMENDMENT ACT, 1890.

**Mr. JORDAN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Irish Local Government Board have yet made and issued such regulations, as they are empowered to do by Part 5 of "The Public Health Acts Amendment Act, 1890," by which Municipal Corporations, Urban and other Authorities, may borrow money by the creation of stock; is he aware that the Enniskillen Town Commissioners and Urban Sanitary Authority more than twelve months ago, namely, in January 1891, complied with the requirements of the Act in relation to its adoption, and requested the Local Government Board immediately to formulate rules to that effect, being the first authorities in Ireland to make application under the Act; in view of the fact that the Act has been put into operation long since in England, will he explain wherefore the delay by the Irish Local Government Board; and will he say whether or not the Irish Local Government Board will at all, and when, issue those necessary regulations, to enable Irish Authorities to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act?

**Mr. JACKSON:** Some necessary delay has occurred in the preparation of the regulations referred to; but they are now completed, and will be forthwith promulgated.

#### WEST CLARE AND THE SCHEDULED DISTRICTS.

**Mr. JORDAN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has received a Memorial from the fishermen, labourers, small farmers, and others in different districts of West Clare, praying him to include the maritime Baronies of Ibricene, Corcomrae, and Moyasta in the list of scheduled districts, with a view to the improvement of harbours, the planting of trees, the improvement of the breed of cattle, and the development of fisheries and agriculture; and if His Excellency has favourably considered their application?

Mr. JACKSON: The Memorial in question has been received and referred to the Congested Districts Board for their consideration.

#### YELLOW FEVER AT SANTOS.

Mr. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that it is reported the yellow fever at Santos has reached such a height that there is no one left to carry on business, the well being obliged to devote attention to the sick; that in consequence merchandise has accumulated so as to block the streets; that the epidemic has been aggravated by the authorities continuing to dredge the port; and whether he has any means of informing the shipping community of the condition of the port other than the brief notice in the *Board of Trade Journal*, or of otherwise guarding against the risks of British subjects trading in that port?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir; I believe the facts as stated by the hon. Member are substantially accurate. On the 8th February I caused a notice to be sent to the daily papers, to the Press Agencies, and to Lloyd's, suggesting that, owing to the insanitary condition of Santos, no ships should be chartered for that port. I do not see what further steps I could usefully take, but probably some good may be done by the public attention which my hon. Friend has called to the matter.

#### ENNISKILLEN GAOL.

Mr. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Prisons Board claim the area in front of the gaol in Enniskillen, extending from the gaol wall to the channel adjoining the country road leading south to Castlecoole; and, if so, is it the duty of the Board to keep it in proper repair and clean it; will they either do so, or hand it over to the Local Authority, the Town Commissioners, to put it into and keep it in proper condition; and is this gaol being now used as a prison, or is it intended that the authorities will discontinue its use as such, and permit it to fall into further dilapidation; if not, will they instruct

an engineer to inspect and report on the condition and appearance of the outside front wall, doors, &c., with a view to due repairs?

Mr. JACKSON: The subject-matter of this question is one which necessitates some inquiry, and I shall be glad if the hon. Member would be good enough to put a further question on the Paper.

#### FLEET STREET POST OFFICE.

Mr. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that it is a matter of constant occurrence for letters addressed to the newspaper offices in the neighbourhood of Fleet Street and posted before 3 a.m. not to be delivered till noon on that day; and whether he will direct inquiry to be made at the Fleet Street office into the cause of this delay?

Mr. BIGWOOD (Middlesex, Brentford): I would like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that inconvenience of a similar character exists in the suburbs?

Sir JAMES FERGUSON: I am informed that no such complaints have been received. My hon. Friend does not say where the letters in question were posted. The 3 a.m. collection is only made in the town districts of London and certain suburbs.

#### THE CASE OF FLORENCE CAWOOD.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of a girl Florence Cawood; and whether in order to prevent a repetition of such cases, he will consider the advisability of proposing alterations in the law to prevent girls being sent to gaol and sentenced to long terms of confinement in reformatories for offences not of a criminal character?

\*Mr. MATTHEWS: My attention has been called to this case, and I have directed the release of the girl alluded to. The recent Government Bill relating to reformatories had the effect of limiting the application of the reformatory system to cases of a really criminal character, and even in those cases made preliminary imprisonment a matter for the discretion of the commit-

ting Magistrate. I should be very glad to see this provision become law. I wish, however, to guard myself from saying that a young person escaping from an industrial school should in no case be sent to a reformatory.

#### GERMAN EMIGRANTS.

**MR. CHARLES WILSON:** I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Government has been called to the proposed alteration in the German Laws, by which the transit of emigrants through English ports will be prohibited; and whether he can give any information on the subject?

\***MR. J. W. LOWTHER:** No information upon the proposals mentioned has yet been received at the Foreign Office, but Sir E. Malet will be asked for a Report upon the subject.

#### THE CLAREMORRIS AND COLLOONEY RAILWAY.

**MR. JORDAN:** I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has seen the statement of the Chairman, Sir Francis Brady, Bart., at the half-yearly meeting of the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company, on Friday last, in relation to the proposed agreement between the Government and that Company for the completion and working of the Claremorris and Collooney line—namely,

"There remains to be executed a formal document by the Board of Works. It would appear that some one has discovered that part of the agreement proposed by the Treasury was at variance with the provisions of some Act of Parliament. I am not able to say how far this may be well-grounded, but if it be, no doubt the Government will be able to take steps to remove all technical difficulties, and enable the work to be continued without delay;"

is he aware that the Directors of the Waterford and Limerick Company refuse to carry out their arrangement with the Treasury, except in violation of "The Tramways Act, 1883," and to the detriment of the guaranteeing cess-payers of the Counties of Sligo and Mayo; and if the Waterford and Limerick Company continue such action, will the Government take such other steps as will, at the earliest possible date, make the line from Claremorris and Collooney available for the traffic of the district?

**MR. JACKSON:** Sir, in answer to this question, I have not seen the statement referred to in the first part of the question. The facts are, I believe, that the Waterford and Limerick Company have refused to sign the agreement or to accept the proposal which has been made to them with reference to this railway without some alteration of the law, the arrangement made being apparently in violation of the Act of 1883. With reference to the last portion of the question, no doubt, if the Waterford and Limerick Company refuse to carry out the agreement, it will then be for the Government to consider in what form they can accomplish the carrying out of the line in some other way. But I would be unwilling at present to believe that the Waterford and Limerick Company had said the last word on that subject; because, if they declined absolutely to carry out the agreement, they will, no doubt, release the Government from the offer the Government have already made. They have had sufficient time to consider the matter, and I am quite sure they will come to a decision before long.

#### THE NEW MAGAZINE RIFLE.

**MR. HANBURY (Preston):** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a decision has yet been arrived at as to the patents in connection with the new Magazine rifle; what persons have established a claim to payment for such patents, and whether any person in Government employment is among the number; and what amounts have been paid to, or are intended to be paid to, them respectively on account of their inventions or patents?

\***MR. E. STANHOPE:** It has been admitted that the British Magazine Rifle Company and Messrs. Greenwood and Batley are entitled to payments on account of patents connected with the rifle and ammunition respectively. The amounts to be paid are, I am sorry to say, not yet finally settled. The above statement does not include patents taken out by persons in the Government employment. I have declined to recognise the claim of Mr. Rigby, the Superintendent of the Small Arms Factory; but as regards Mr. Speed, I am considering whether, looking at his position as a Government employé,

and to the circumstances under which his inventions were originated, worked out and patented, he is entitled to any reward at all.

**SUNDAY POST AT UPPERCHURCH,  
TIPPERARY.**

**MR. P. J. O'BRIEN** (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, with reference to the memorial received from the inhabitants of Drum-bane and Upperchurch, County Tipperary, praying for the accommodation of a Sunday post at Upperchurch, whether the only cost to be incurred would be the payment of a rural messenger for the one day in the week extra, for a distance of five miles, from Ballycahill to Upperchurch; and whether, in the interests of the Public Service, having regard to the large district to be accommodated with a population of nearly 3,000 inhabitants, he will see his way to have the want provided for?

**SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** The cost to be incurred (between £7 and £8 a year) would be the payment of a rural postman for the one day in the week extra, but the distance which would have to be walked would not be five miles but fully twelve miles. As the existing post is carried on at a serious loss it is not considered that any extra expenditure should be incurred in connection with it.

**CLERKS IN THE CENTRAL TELE-  
GRAPH OFFICE.**

**MR. M'CARTAN** (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether second class clerks in the Central Telegraph Office, who are performing duties exactly similar to those performed by first class clerks, are entitled to promotion or extra pay in respect of the performance of such duties; whether any second class clerks now performing first class duties shall receive compensation for such periods as they have performed duties of a higher class; whether the clerks have any means of distinguishing between first and second class duties during their performance; and whether he will consider the desirability of directing that in future all promotions from the second to the first class are made so far retrospective as to

ensure that the clerk promoted "enjoys a similar advantage" to that of his immediate predecessors?

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** Second class telegraphists, who, owing to the exigencies of the Service, may be temporarily employed upon first class duties are undoubtedly qualifying themselves for promotion to the superior class when vacancies occur. Without such opportunity for acquiring the necessary qualification they, of course, could not be promoted, and when promotion is obtained this in itself affords sufficient compensation for any temporary discharge of higher duties. This is the universal rule of the Service, and I should think of all other Services, and there is no ground whatever for altering it. The distinction between first and second class duties is generally well understood, but there may be cases, of course, in which the one very nearly approaches the other. It is not the practice of the Service in any case to make promotion retrospective beyond the date of the vacancy.

**POLLING CARDS.**

**\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON:** If the House will allow me I will take this opportunity of mentioning, with reference to questions as to what may be inserted in polling cards so as to pass by post at the halfpenny rate, that the distinctions maintained appear to be so troublesome, that I have given instructions that the name and number of the voter may be inserted in writing, and a circular to this effect will be issued immediately.

**ARBORICULTURE IN IRELAND.**

**MR. HARRISON** (Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the authorities in Ireland, following the precedent set by the Board of Agriculture in England, have taken any steps to provide for suitable instruction in the higher and lower branches of arboriculture and silviculture, as advised by the Select Committee on Forestry in 1887?

**MR. JACKSON:** The authorities in Ireland have taken some practical steps with reference to the questions of forestry and of planting, and I have already answered questions on the sub-

jeet two or three times. I am not aware that they have taken any steps for instruction in the branches referred to in the question, nor do I think that they would. That would very well come within the powers or duties of the Congested Districts Board, to whom the question has been referred.

#### THE STAMP DISTRIBUTOR AT GOOLE.

MR. AUSTIN (York, W.R., Osgold-cross): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to a memorial sent to the Treasury, numerous signed by ship-owners, bankers, merchants, chairmen of the Local Bodies, and others, gentlemen of both political parties, protesting against the position of stamp distributor being taken from the office of Messrs. Gardiner & Co., printers and publishers, Goole, they having held the office for many years to the satisfaction of the public and faithfully to the Crown; if it is true that Mr. Elvin, the printer and publisher of a new Conservative newspaper recently established at Goole, has been appointed stamp distributor; and if he will consider the additional appointment of Mr. Robert Hudson, a member of the firm of Messrs. Gardiner & Co., who has practically discharged the duties of the office for some time?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Sir, no such Memorial as that described by the hon. Member has been brought to my notice. I understand that Mr. Gardiner resigned last autumn. Mr. Elvin, who was strongly recommended from other quarters and is well qualified, was selected. The salary attached is only £8. The Inland Revenue Department cannot, I understand, recommend that this £8 should be further sub-divided by being allocated to two individuals.

MR. AUSTIN: Do I understand the First Lord of the Treasury to say that no such Memorial has been received?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No such Memorial has been received.

MR. AUSTIN: I have a letter acknowledging receipt of the Memorial.

#### THE OFFICE OF WOODS AND FORESTS AND LAND REVENUES OF THE CROWN.

MR. SAMUELSON (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when he will introduce the Bill promised last Session by his predecessor, to carry out the recommendations of the Committee of this House which reported upon the administration of the Office of Woods and Forests and Land Revenues of the Crown?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham): I hope very shortly to be able to introduce the Crown Lands Bill—probably in the course of next week.

MR. SAMUELSON: Before Easter?

SIR JOHN GORST: Oh, certainly.

#### THE LAGOS DISTRICT.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies a question of which I have given him private notice whether, having regard to the statement he made in reply to the hon. Baronet the Member for North-West Manchester (Sir Henry Houldsworth), it is correct, as reported, that the Jebus are still blocking trade; and whether he will give the House any more recent information on the subject?

SIR JOHN GORST: I am asked to reply on behalf of my right hon. Friend. In reply to the first question, I am informed that an arrangement has been made with the Jebus on the 21st of January, by which they undertook to keep the roads and river free to all persons, and to levy no tolls, in consideration of a yearly present of £500. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has now learnt by telegram that they have broken this agreement, and that an officer sent to remonstrate was not allowed to proceed to Jebu Ode, the capital of their territory. The Secretary of State has also just learnt by telegram that the letter sent to the Egba authorities has been returned unopened, and that they decline to have any communication with the Governor of Lagos. Mr. Carter, the Governor of Lagos, is up the country, but is expected back on 9th March. He has been instructed by telegraph to report at once fully upon

the position, and as to the measures which he would recommend to be taken.

#### THE ARMY AND NAVY ESTIMATES.

MR. H. H. FOWLER: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to lay the Navy Estimates and the Army Estimates on the Table of the House; and I would ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the Rule of the House that Estimates relating to the Army and Navy must be laid on the Table within ten days after the House goes into Committee of Supply, which ten days have now expired?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am afraid it is not always possible to adhere to that resolution. The Army Estimates, I understand, will be circulated to-morrow, and the Navy Estimates, I hope, in the early part of next week.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION.

##### MORNING SITTINGS.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: With relation, more or less, to the question which has been put, I wish to give notice that I will on Thursday, in view of the condition of Supply, move that, on Tuesdays and Fridays, Morning Sittings should be taken for the purpose of dealing with Supply, and for the purpose of reading Bills for the first time, but for those purposes alone.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): The first business of the House to-morrow is to promote peace and goodwill in Ireland by providing some means of restoring evicted tenants in that country. If the Sitting begins at 2 o'clock, that will not afford to hon. Members who promote the Bill any fair or adequate opportunity of having their proposals properly considered. And on the principle that the better the day the better the deed, I would suggest that the House meet at 12 o'clock, the usual hour.

MR. J. REDMOND (Waterford): For my own part, I have always in past years voted in favour of the adjournment of the House on Ash Wednesday, and I would not on this occasion interfere to express objection to that.

\* *Sir John Gorst*

But the fortune of the ballot has cast for to-morrow a Bill that Members in every part of the House must acknowledge is one of far-reaching importance. Indeed, the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House will be the last to deny that it is an important question. There are at this moment in Ireland many hundreds of families of evicted tenants, whose position is such that so long as these tenants remain as they are, the public peace must be imperilled. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House himself recognised the importance of the matter, for in the Act of last year he inserted a clause for the purpose of enabling them to be restored to their holdings. That clause was limited as to time, and that time has expired, and the tenants are still out of their homes. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, no one will deny, least of all the right hon. Gentleman, the importance of considering this question from the point of view of the tenants, of the landlords, and of those who are responsible for the government and tranquillity of Ireland. That is the subject to be dealt with by the Bill first in the Orders for to-morrow, and no one will deny that it cannot be adequately discussed in the three hours which will be at our disposal if the House meets at 2 o'clock. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a strong case for saying that it would be in the interests of the people of Ireland if the House were to meet at the ordinary hour to-morrow. It may be that the old custom of the Adjournment is venerable by its age; but I am bound to say that I think, in the case of the vast majority of the Members of the House, the Adjournment is very little short of an act of hypocrisy; and if an inquiry were made as to the number of Members who take advantage of the Adjournment to attend Divine Service, the result would be very extraordinary. I appeal to the House not to stand in the way of a complete discussion of this Bill. The meeting at 12 would not prevent any hon. Member from attending Divine Service and then coming to the House to express his views and record his vote, for the discussion is certain to go on all the after-

noon. For these reasons I agree with the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) in voting against the Adjournment of the House, and I appeal to hon. Members to assist us the Representatives of Ireland, in our effort to obtain for this Bill, which affects so greatly the well-being of our people, a full discussion.

#### SCHOOLS (IRELAND.)

Returns [Feb 29] ordered—

“(A) Individual Schools. The total Grants, or the annual School Returns certified by the Managers, made by the Irish National Board of Education in the year 1890 to each of the ordinary Schools under (a) Episcopalian Protestant management; (b) Roman Catholic management; (c) Presbyterian management; also, to (d) Schools under the management of other Denominations; (e) Schools under the joint Protestant management of Episcopalians and Presbyterians; or (f) other Protestant management exclusively; and (g) Schools under the joint management of Protestants and Roman Catholics (exclusive of Grants to Convent and Monastic Schools, Gaol and Workhouse and other (Model, &c.) Schools):

The Return to specify—

- (I.) Whether the School is under a local Committee recognised by the Commissioners; and
- (II.) To give in separate columns for each ordinary School (a) the number on the rolls; (b) the average attendance;
- (III.) In separate columns, Details under the several heads for each ordinary School: (a) salaries, gratuities, premiums to teaching staff, including assistants, monitors, and teachers of needlework; (b) results payments; (c) books and free stock;
- (IV.) The average Cost of each Scholar in average daily attendance, calculated on the total of the Board's Grants;
- (V.) The amount of local Aid raised for each School (a) in School fees; (b) from other sources, including Rates and Customs and Excise payments;
- (VI.) The average Cost of each Scholar in average daily attendance, calculated on the total local Aid;
- (B) Similar Return in the case of all Convent and Monastic Schools for the year 1890, in (a) Attendances; (b) Grants; (c) local Aid; (d) average Cost per Pupil in average daily attendance, computed (a) on the Board's Grants; (b) on the local Aid;
- (C) (I.) The total number of ordinary Schools for the years 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, with total number of pupils on rolls, and average attendance, with percentage of average attendance to total on rolls; the total amount of Grants made, distinguishing (a) results fees; (b) salaries and other payments; and giving the average cost of each pupil in

average attendance on the totals of the columns under (a) results fees; (b) salaries, &c.;

- (II.) (a) Total local Aid; and (b) average cost per pupil (in average attendance) on local Aid;

(D) Similar Return for Convent and Monastic Schools for the same years:

(E) Similar Return for the Board's Model Schools for the same years (specific charges for dietary and other residential expenses connected with the training departments of the Model Schools to be excluded):

(F) Return from the several Denominational Training Colleges in Ireland aided by the Board, for each year since their establishment, and ending with the session terminated on the 31st day of August, 1890, and showing—

- (I.) The length of the course of training (a) the total amount of Board's Grants, and the total certified college expenditure for each session; (b) the total numbers trained (males and females separate); (c) the average cost of each Queen's scholar who completed the course of training (1) Board's Grants, (2) total certified college expenditure;
- (II.) The total number of Queen's scholars for each College who, since completing the final course of training ended on or before the 31st day of August, 1890, have obtained charge of National or other public elementary Schools in Ireland;
- (III.) The names, titles, functions, and salaries, &c., of each of the professors appointed on the Staffs of these Colleges:

The Return also to include particulars for the principal and for each of the officials of these Colleges, and to distinguish lay and clerical;

(G) Corresponding Returns for the Board's own Training College in Marlborough Street for five years ending with the 31st day of August, 1890, with religious denominations of Queen's scholars in residence:

(H) Summaries and averages in case of last two Returns.”—(Mr. T. W. Russell.)

#### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

(ASH WEDNESDAY.)

Motion made, and Question put, “That this House do meet Tomorrow, at Two of the clock.”—(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

The House divided :—Ayes 174 ; Noes 154.—(Div. List, No. 14.)

#### RECREATION GROUNDS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Llewellyn, Bill to facilitate the provision of Recreation Grounds in Rural Parishes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Llewellyn and Sir Edward Birkbeck.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 201.]



## GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

(6.45.) COLONEL HUGHES (Woolwich): I beg, Sir, to move the Motion which is printed on the Paper in my name. I have considered this question during the Recess, in order to make myself thoroughly acquainted with the *minutiae* of the case, and I also wrote to the First Lord of the Admiralty and received a reply, which, while not admitting that there was any great injustice, admitted that the funds were short, and that for a considerable number of years the claims had been greater than the fund was able to satisfy. I came to the conclusion that the plea of the money not being sufficient was not an answer to the claim of the seamen, if there had been a contract or anything in the nature of an implied contract. It seemed to me the only way to dispose of the matter was to ask for a Select Committee, which would settle the question once for all, so that the agitation might cease. I am happy to inform the House that the Government have agreed with me that it would be better to deal with the subject by referring it to a Select Committee, and though I acknowledge with thankfulness the support which I know I should have received from all parts of the House if I went to a Division, I am glad to be relieved of the unpleasantness and uncertainty of such a course by the Government having acceded to my solicitation and granted the Committee. The Committee having been granted, I do not think I have a right to detain the House. Suffice it is to say that my letter to the First Lord of the Admiralty and his reply have been issued to-day, and I hope every Member of the House will take the trouble to read that correspondence, as it contains all that I could have said. I ask, therefore, to be excused from doing more than move the Motion which stands in my name, which I do with a great deal of pleasure, and the hope that at last justice will be done to seamen who have served their country well and should have a just reward.

(6.50.) MR. T. W. BOORD (Greenwich): I am delighted to hear that the Government have granted the Committee. The main fact it will have to

deal with is that there are about 2,000 men who are very dissatisfied with their position, and that itself seems to me almost sufficient justification for the action of the Government. Under the circumstances just stated, I shall not venture to take up the time of the House, but shall content myself with seconding the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the causes which have led to the limitation in the number of seamen receiving age pensions out of Greenwich Hospital Funds, and to consider whether any steps can properly be taken to make provision for a larger number of age pensioners, and to inquire into their alleged grievances:

That the Committee do consist of Nine Members:

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records:

That Five be the quorum."—(Colonel Hughes.)

(6.52.) CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): I desire, in a few words, to express my satisfaction at the course the Government have adopted. The subject is one which has been brought before the House by myself and others for a number of years, and it is a growing grievance, the men affected being something like double the number that it was when I first called attention to the matter. There are several grievances to be considered. We have to consider whether the fund has been properly dealt with, whether there has been any misappropriation or not, and how the funds may be increased. It is a general idea among the pensioners that they have not been treated fairly in this matter, and that faith has been broken with them. When after their first term of service they agreed for a second term, they did so in the belief that this Greenwich age pension was an inalienable right, and that they would get it without doubt at 55 or 60 years of age. The Admiralty have introduced rules that were not thought of at the time of the Hospital Charter, and, as a matter of fact, some of the men do not now enjoy those benefits which were then held out to them. In the old days there were only two principles to guide the granting of these pensions: one the question of age, and the other that of the roster. All that is set on one side now, and a principle of selection is

adopted. That will be a point for the Committee to inquire into.

\***MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN** (North East Kent): As representing the dockyard town of Sheerness, where many persons claiming this pension reside, I must ask permission to say a word or two in support of the Motion of my hon. and gallant Friend. There is no doubt that many of these men entered the Service in the full belief that at 55 they would, as a matter of course, become entitled to this pension, and they think themselves hardly treated that, by the retrospective operation of a rule passed after they had entered the Service, they should be deprived of their pensions. It is alleged that this fund has been diverted, and that point could be looked into by the Committee. I am very glad this justice is to be done, and in the name of my constituents I thank the Government.

**MR. J. ROWLANDS** (Finsbury, E.): I know there are many on this side of the House who would have supported the hon. and gallant Member for Woolwich (Colonel Hughes) in his Motion had it gone to a Division. Many of us have had the case brought before us by our constituents, and we are aware that at least they think they are suffering under a great grievance. It is unnecessary to go into the case; but I am sure only justice is being done to them by appointing this Committee to into their case; and if there be no grievance, it will tend to set their minds at rest.

(6.55.) **THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY** (Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Sheffield, Eccleshall): The modified form of the Motion enables the Government to assent to an inquiry into the claims of the naval pensioners. Since the Motion has been on the Paper the Government have become aware that there is a widespread feeling amongst the naval pensioners that their claims to Greenwich age pensions have not been fully satisfied, and the Government feel that there is no class of men whose interests, sentiments, and even prejudices are more deserving of generous consideration than those gallant sailors and marines who have so long served their

Queen with loyalty and credit. The Government, therefore, while not receding from the view which has been expressed on this question by successive Boards of Admiralty, and both Parties, are glad to concede the inquiry. By the first of next month there will be no less than 7,500 naval pensioners in receipt of Greenwich age pensions, being an increase of 400 on last year. The Admiralty have also decided that the amount of naval pension is no longer to be taken into account in awarding Greenwich age pensions. That is a boon very much pressed by the Committee which sat last year. I may also say that at the present time, out of a total expenditure of £168,000, no less than £148,000 is directly devoted to the benefit of the sailors and marines. The Government grant this Committee with satisfaction at the request of the hon. and gallant Member who has taken such great interest in the claims of these pensioners, and are confident that the result of the investigation will be to the credit of the direction and administration of the funds of this most useful institution, Greenwich Hospital.

Motion agreed to.

#### SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON.

##### MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

(7.0.) **MR. DIXON-HARTLAND** (Middlesex, Uxbridge): I beg to move—

“That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, asking Her to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the action and the extravagance of the London School Board, and the cause of the high rates raised for its use in the Metropolis.”

I wish, in the first place, to say that I do not propose to take up unnecessarily the time of the House, but the documents I have to deal with are of a character which may require some time in the treatment of them, and to justify my action in asking for a Royal Commission. In the first place, I wish to say that the Motion is not intended in any way as an attack upon education. It is, in fact, in its favour; as anything which tends to make education unpopular is injurious to education itself. Under the name of promoting education the money of the ratepayers has been shamefully squandered; the pockets of the

Metropolitan ratepayers have been scandalously picked; and this has been fully recognised by Mr. Diggle, Mr. Helby, Mr. Lobb, and many other members of the Board. They have shown that they considered that this is a case which should be thoroughly investigated. In July, 1888, the following resolution was placed upon the agenda paper of the Board:—

"That Sir Richard Temple and Colonel Hughes be requested to take the necessary steps in the House of Commons to obtain a Royal Commission, with powers to call for necessary papers and persons, to investigate upon oath the whole mode by which sites have been acquired and school buildings erected thereon by the School Board for London,"

which, of course, was not carried, and in July, 1890, a similar motion was also defeated. Now, first, with regard to the cost of the School Board, I find that up to the 23rd March, 1891, it has been no less than £26,399,066, less about £1,000,000 for the payment of loans. The debt was £7,309,000, and the interest and repayment on that amount was about £400,000, or about 3d. in the £1, the amount which we were told in 1870 would never be exceeded, and yet that is now necessary for the loan only. As late as the year 1875 the rate was only 3d. in the £1, and now it is 1s., with every probability of its being increased 1d. per year for some years to come. I ask you, what would be said to the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he proposed to add a penny a year to the Income Tax? If the rateable value of the Metropolis had continued as it was in 1871, the rate would have been 1s. 6d. in the £1; but the increase in the value from £19,970,000 to £33,000,000, or an increase of 65 per cent., has alone kept the rate to 1s. This is more strongly shown by the rate in 1871, which produced £83,200, whilst in 1891 it produced £137,800. During the last three years the rate has been increasing by leaps and bounds, till in 1891 it has reached £1,483,174, or £454,291 increase. It may be said that this is due to the increase of scholars. But what are the facts? I find that in the year 1891 the average attendance was only 14,130 more than in 1889; while the increase of rates has been 44·15 per cent., the increase of attend-

ance has been only 4·12 per cent. In the year 1875 the precept of the Board was for £551,247, while in 1890 it amounted to nearly £1,500,000, or what is practically about treble the amount. In order to show, further, that the vast increase of expenditure has not been accounted for by the additional numbers educated, I may say that while in 1883 240,000 were educated for £679,595, in 1891 it cost £1,403,280 to educate 349,291 children, or, in fact, more than double the amount to educate only 100,000 more. Now, having given these facts, I wish to refer to the reasons which I believe have led to this extraordinary increase of expenditure. It is equally intelligible how the extravagance arises. Given a body of men, many of whom have no practical acquaintance with business, and some of whom are possessed by impracticable notions, and given still further that they are not bound by the limitations which affect a man who is carrying on business on his own account, but has a practically unlimited fund upon which to draw, and it stands to reason that an extravagant expenditure will follow, almost as a matter of course. But when, in addition to facts, you have to consider the dishonesty of contractors and the carelessness of Boards, and the gross negligence, if not worse, of architects and clerks of works, and fraud in the purchase of sites, to which must be added the exorbitant salaries of the staff and teachers, it is not difficult to see how the expenditure of the School Board has so enormously increased, all which subjects can only be thoroughly brought to light by a Royal Commission. The School Management Committee is one of the great spending departments of the Board. It at present pays to teachers £910,790 a year, the salaries rising automatically. The teachers now receive 52s. 4d. per child, or 1s. 10d. more than in 1890, and I find that a large number of them are husbands and wives. Seven of those couples receive over £600 a year, 26 over £500, 27 over £400, 40 over £300, 108 over £200, whilst there are only 21 receiving under £200 a year. The highest single salary paid to a teacher is £460. I can only say

*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*

that if the teachers are worth all this money, they are too good, as they certainly are too expensive, for Board schools, and their salaries are such as would be welcomed by clergymen and ministers. The present salaries of men teachers is £326 1s. 0d. to £136 10s. 2d., and women teachers, £234 6s. 10d. to £111 5s. 1d. The salaries of the teachers have increased during the past ten years 107 per cent., to nearly £1,000,000, or 7d. in the £1 on the rates, with no increase of educational progress or practical training; and whilst the average from 1886 to 1888 was £1 17s. 2d. per child per annum only for school management, it is now no less than £2 9s. 1d. I think that the following, taken from the Report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1890-91, page 26, will show how much higher this cost is than that of the voluntary schools—

“We may mention, with regard to the principal teachers in the Metropolitan district, that in the past year the average salary of 368 masters in voluntary schools was £152 17s. 2d., and that of 379 masters in Board schools £283 10s. 10d., while 762 schoolmistresses in Board schools enjoyed an average income of £199 11s. 5d., as compared with £90 18s. 6d.—that of 797 teachers in voluntary schools. The salaries of 11 masters in voluntary schools and 167 in Board schools amounted to £300 a year and upwards, whilst three mistresses in voluntary and 366 in Board schools had salaries of £200 and upwards.”

And to show that the cost is beyond that of other districts, it will be found that teachers of equal capacity outside the London School Board receive salaries from 25 to 33 per cent. less, and at the same time do their duty with equal satisfaction to the Government Inspectors. Those are matters into which I think the strictest investigation is required, and matters into which only a Royal Commission can adequately inquire into; because it is known that teachers have actively canvassed for members of committees, many of whom owe their election to them, and that some of these members have had the whole of their election expenses paid by the teachers, the result being that paid officers of the Board combine to elect the members whose duty it is to decide how much these officers shall be

paid. This surely is a scandal, and one which should be investigated. While dealing with this part of the question, it may not be amiss to state that the cost of each scholar in the London Board schools is £3 2s. 7½d. while in voluntary schools it is £2 4s. 1d. The cost borne by the ratepayers of London, £1 15s. 8½d.; Birmingham, 18s. 8½d.; Bradford, 8s. 9d.; Bristol, £1 3s. 10½d.; Leeds, 14s. 2½d.; Liverpool, 13s. 7½d.; Manchester, 7s. 11½d.; Sheffield, 8s. 10d.; to which 10s. for new Education Act must now be added. I should like to refer to the stores department. No proper records are kept, and teachers have only to ask and to have. The stores superintendents are allowed to order what they please, and from what firms they please. In answer to a return to teachers, it has been shown that 329,129 books, or 50 tons, were returned as unnecessary. The cost of books had risen from £31,619 to £52,800 per annum, or from 1s. 10d. to 3s. per child. Amongst the requisitions that were made the other day there was one for skeletons to cost £82 10s., and that was for a single school, which asked for the skeletons of twelve codfish, amounting to £3 each, and, would it be believed, the University of Cambridge has only one of these skeletons for all its pupils. Such Votes as these are really so much money extorted from the ratepayers and thrown away. And only two days ago the mistress of the Belleville Road school prayed to have a full sized human skeleton taken away, as it frightened the children. In regard to the question of sites, I have to say that up to September, 1891, the cost was £3,044,682, including legal charges and surveyors' expenses. The sites previous to 1885 were selected (many during the recess) by the Board's surveyor, Mr. Andrew Young, a man who has had no practical knowledge, having simply been a clerk in the finance department. These sites were in many cases costly and unsuitable, and the surveyor had his own brother, Mr. Douglas Young, as auctioneer to sell the materials on such sites. Naturally he did not select sites where materials had not to be sold. The architect's brother-in-law, Mr. Longden, supplied all the iron

for twelve years, and although iron went down between 60 and 70 per cent., the schedule price was never revised, and the clause in the contract was that the iron was to be supplied by the Board who did it through this official. An official of the Board—the architect's clerk, Mr. McFarlane—who is still in their employment), when a stir was made about the matter, on a bank-holiday devoted his time, unknown to the Board, in examining and destroying documents; and yet, though the Chairman, both in committee and at the Board, moved for his dismissal he is still kept on. The sites are not only the most extravagant that can be found, but it will be found, on looking at the deeds, that directly it is mooted that a site is likely to be wanted it changes hands a number of times, and reaches the Board at a great increase in price. Take, for instance, the Raywood Street site, opposite the Dog's Home at Battersea. It eventually was purchased for £7,000, when it could first have been purchased for £2,000. Take the Ponton Street site, at Nine Elms, for which £14,000 was given, and a school erected where it was not wanted, and is never half filled. These are striking instances, but sites were also purchased where all the gravel had been dug out, and they were simply dust heaps. What is worse still, there are sites which, having been bought at ridiculous prices, have been proved to be not fit for use, and had to be sold again, or attempts made to sell them. For instance, the St. George's Road, Pimlico, site, which cost £11,000; the best offer that could be obtained for it was £5,000, a price which could not now be obtained. This inquiry is, I say, wanted in order to find out who had the money, in numberless cases, and the information can only be obtained by means of such an inquiry as I ask for, and which, I believe, the public demand. In regard to the question of buildings, up to March, 1891, the amount spent was £4,778,746, exclusive of land and fittings. Thirteen builders received contracts for £2,153,345 6s. 6d. The Board has 410 schools, of which 356 were erected by the Board, and 163 have been found faulty or insanitary, and not single school was in accordance with

the specification. In a Report dealing with the question as to how the schools have been built, it is stated:—

“With some exceptions they have been badly planned and badly built; many of them are only huge barns, with an ornamental exterior, defectively ventilated and defectively lighted. The materials used in the schools complained of are the veriest rubbish, whilst the best have been specified in the contracts and paid for; the work scamped and executed in a disgraceful manner. Instead of the schools resting upon solid foundations, investigations have shown that they rest upon loose and soapy foundations, foundry-ashes foundations, mud foundations, and in some cases no foundations at all. The brickwork, both inside and outside, has been altogether inferior to that specified and paid for. . . . The mortar used was absolutely rotten—containing no binding or adhesive properties and no grit, and on being touched crumbles to powder; also an entire absence of hair in the mortar, although it was specified in the contract and has been paid for. Half-burnt clay has been used in the place of sand; instead of the best quality of Portland stone, free from all defects, the commonest has been used, full of sand-hole fractures and the edges broken; evidently taken from the outside beds of the quarry instead of from the inside. In the matter of the lath and plastering, single laths instead of a lath and a-half have been used. The plastering being rotten, the result is that large patches are constantly falling. The painters' work has been scamped shamefully; the doors and framings improperly fixed; the glass 21 oz. only, instead of 26 oz., as specified and paid for; lead of one weight was paid for, whilst that used was 1 or 2 lbs. per square foot less weight; the woodwork and the floors executed in a most dishonest manner, laid with absolutely no concrete on them, covered only with wet clay and muck, with the result that dry rot has set in.”

Take, out of many examples, the case of the Goodrich Road schools, opened in 1886 by Mr. G. C. Whitely, and who then described it as a model school. On 2nd June, 1890, the assistant architect for repairs drew attention to the repairs that would be necessary in consequence of the defective manner in which the school had been built. Exclusive of the work to drains, the cost of undermining, repairs, &c., to the school has been £2,700. From this school five cartloads of sewerage were removed from under the floor, and the architect, Mr. Bailey, wrote to the contractors to say he must call the Board's attention to its state, but never did, because he had actually given a final certificate five weeks before, without even inspecting the

*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*

work. In regard to the Latimer Road school, it has been shown that on 1st December, 1890, a portion of the ceiling in one of the class rooms came down with a great crash on the children's heads, and as this was the fourth time that such a thing had taken place, the assistant architect was called upon to examine and report, and in his Report stated that—

"The ceilings in the girls' and infants' departments are in a more or less unsafe condition, and liable to fall at any time."

This school was opened in 1880, at a cost of £20,767 17s. 10d. In the case of the Princess Road School, opened February, 1885, in November, 1889, the assistant architect found the walls, chimney-stacks, and piers carrying the superstructure of the school very defective: subsequently he reported settlements, which, upon being watched, were found to increase and became dangerous, the whole superstructure being liable to collapse. This had to be repaired at a cost of over £2,000. In the case of Salters Hill School, 8th November, 1889, the Clerk of the Works in charge of the school building reported serious cracks and settlements in the lofty gable walls. The architect and assistant architect for repairs made an examination, and found a 6-in. drain-pipe running along the wall under the concrete foundation, the concrete having been placed upon it; the drain-pipe consequently broke and became choked, the drainage going into the foundation. Immediate steps were taken to shore up the school to prevent its falling. The walls subsequently were underpinned with cement concrete down to a good foundation. It has been repaired at a cost of £800. I do not think it is necessary to go through the whole list, but I could show that every one of the 163 schools has been repaired at the cost of the ratepayers. But what is far worse is the insanitary condition of the buildings, scattering illness and death amongst the teachers and children of the poor. In some cases the flooring covered leaky drains and soil-pipes. In others the pipes were not even jointed; in others the pipes were laid the wrong way, or with no fall, and not

even connected with the main drains. In fact, the children were living in a vast sewer, and no wonder the bereaved parents complained whose children died from diphtheria, scarlet, or typhoid fever. Take, as examples, the Hamond Square Schoolhouse, Hoxton. After the caretaker's five children had been removed by death, the parish Sanitary Inspector found that the contractors had erected the building over a series of running cesspools, which were immediately under the floors of his rooms. The doctors' and funeral bills amounted to over £100, and that poor caretaker has never had a penny compensation. This was brought before the Board of Hoxton, and here is an extract from the medical officer's Report for the parish of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, for 1886, p. 81:—

"The Board School in Hamond Square it was necessary for the medical officer to bring more especially under the notice of your Sanitary Committee to receive instructions thereon. It might have been inferred that, at the time of the construction, ordinary precautionary measures would have been adopted to keep the premises of the school from proximate contact with noxious decaying accumulations; but, instead of that, accumulations of sewage matter had been allowed to remain buried within the walls of the house, and, as the Inspector says, when the ground under one room was opened to the depth of about three or four feet, it was seen to be made up of old bricks and other rubbish, and under that was an old brick drain. Further examination showed that the wall of the house had been built over this drain, the wall being carried on a 'relieving stone template' to avoid disturbing or removing the old drain. In the removal of the made-up ground from within the walls of the house, by orders of your Sanitary Committee, a large cesspool was found, and five loads of sewage accumulation had to be removed. These conditions had made the walls of the house foully damp."

With respect to the Globe Terrace School, Bethnal Green, in consequence of 70 children being absent on account of illness, and the repeated complaints of teachers, an investigation was made, with the result that from under the floor of the infants' room two cart-loads of decomposed vegetable and other refuse matter were removed, and nine inches of concrete have since been laid there. In the case of Stockwell Road School divisional offices, built in 1882, complaints were made of repeated

illness amongst the staff, and that bad smells were prevalent. It was found that the drains and the sewer were being freely ventilated into the space under the boarded floor, and through the joints of the boards into the apartment. The earth below the floor was saturated with the discharge from a defective pipe, and was very offensive. The iron soil-pipe had open joints, which admitted sewer gas into the staircase and passages. This school was built on a dust heap. With reference to Curtain Road School, Hoxton (in the parish of Shoreditch), here is an extract from the Report of the Medical Officer of Health, Mr. Alexander, for the year ending 1889 :—

"Immediately under a window in the girls' department were the closets of the infants department, fitted with an ordinary iron trough, the emanations from which passed into the girls' class-rooms."

With respect to Plassy Road School, complaints of bad smells and sickness of children led to examination of drains, with the result that the whole drainage and sanitary arrangements had to be remodelled at a cost of £600, meanwhile blood-poisoning had been going on at a wholesale rate. At Everington Street School there were reported bad smells in the offices, and that upwards of 300 children were absent through illness. An examination showed that the troughs or latrines were not trapped, but that drain air had free access into the closets, and was inhaled by the children. I think that is sufficient to trouble the House with on that point. It is an appalling fact that every school discloses a shocking insanitary condition, and it seems incredible that the Board have disregarded the numerous complaints of teachers and local managers, and have not taken action until they have been compelled by the parish sanitary officer, whose numerous legal documents under the Nuisances Removal Acts may be seen at the offices of the Board. No less than ten such official documents or threats of legal process were received by the Board with regard to the dilapidated and unsanitary condition of Gainsborough Road School, Hackney Wick. For 15 months the caretaker of Catherine Street School, Hoxton, im-

plored the Board to remove a nuisance by which two of his children had been twice stricken down with gastric fever, and it was only when the parish sanitary officer gave the usual legal threat that action was taken. The same with Tottenham Road School, Kingland; after there had been five deaths from diphtheria in the infants' department the parish sanitary officers threatened the Board. Mr. Diggle, Chairman of the Board, made a Report from the Board on the re-establishment of the Board on 1st October, 1891, and summing up he says—

"So far as I have been able to ascertain the facts, not a single school which has been thoroughly examined has been found to be in the state in which it ought to have been; and the cost of remedying these defects and deficiencies not only swells our expenditure now, but must be a considerable burden upon the finances of the Board for many years to come."

It will, doubtless, be thought that all this carelessness was caused by the Board School officers not being properly paid, but I find in the Report of the hon. Member for Evesham (Sir Richard Temple), Chairman of the Finance Committee, that not less than £117,855 12s. 5d. was paid to these gentlemen for ten years during which these scandalous buildings were being erected. The various members of the Board did everything they could to prevent the responsibility being brought home to offenders, and, as I before stated, positively refused to move till ten official documents were before them. In April, 1891, a motion was made that the Works Committee recommend the Board to take action against Mr. Robson, the architect, for neglect of duty. It is hardly necessary to say that was not carried. Mr. Robson was the architect for nearly all the defective schools yet examined, and yet he has been rewarded for the work which he utterly neglected by being made Consulting Architect of the Department of Education for Schools all over the country at a salary of £750 a year and fees; and I am told these fees are considerable. He also kept receiving £500 a year for two years from the London School Board, to see that the buildings which he had planned

*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*

were completed, and which he never attended to. Then with respect to the contractors, many of these escaped because of the four years' limit in the contract, and many others escaped because they got the architects' certificates before even the work was finished. Such enquiry as the School Board has, however, been able to make, has obtained back about £10,000; that is a very small proportion of about a quarter of a million which has been lost by the defects that have taken place. In one case their own architect actually gave evidence against them as to the character of the work. When Mr. Euan Christian, their quantity surveyor, stated at the trial that the work was such as ought not to have been passed, he actually came forward and stated that it was all right. And the Board not only lost the case, but actually had to pay the costs; although before the trial the builders had offered to give up a certain sum, admitting they were wrong. In another case the Board obtained a verdict for £2,141 in the case of the Kilburn Lane Schools, out of a sum of £325,995 9s. 10d. paid the firm on various contracts. But before the money was recovered the firm (Wall Brothers) went into bankruptcy; and when they were examined in reference to this large sum they stated that they never kept any books, and they could not give the Court a single item as to how the money had gone. I think there must have been gross speculation there. A large sum of money must have been given away; and I think this one of the most scandalous cases that ever was brought under my notice. In that case Mr. Justice Day said—

"It is really scarcely conceivable that a public body should have conducted its business in the exceedingly lax manner in which their business seems to have been conducted by the School Board in 1884. You had an architect who actually told you that from the time when he prepared these plans he never went to the school; and he does not limit it to that date at all, but he told you that he never went to this school at all until it was all completed—never went near the place."

Then the jury also, in giving their verdict, added the following rider—

"The jury desire, without absolving the defendants in this case, to express their

VOL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

strong condemnation of the state of things in the Architects Department, as disclosed by this inquiry."

I think that shows that the officers of the Board have not done their duty. The Chairman of the Finance Committee, the hon. Member for Evesham, in his last Report, put it down that it will cost £40,000 a year for some years on extraordinary expenditure on these schools, in addition to £60,000 required for ordinary repairs. I do not know what steps the hon. Gentleman is going to take, but all I can say is to refer to his own election address, which he published the other day, when he applied for re-election, in which he says—

"Much has undoubtedly been done by the present Board in these directions, but much remains to be done. When the evidence taken by the Special Committee appointed by the present Board proves that past Boards have paid for a depth of foundations for schools which do not exist to the stated depth; that they have been charged and have paid for material under the tar pavement in school playgrounds which does not exist at all; that in the matter of the bricks, the mortar, the woodwork, the lead, and other materials used in the construction of schools the requirements of the building specifications have not been observed; and that the manner in which accounts for buildings have been presented and passed by the Works Committee has been of the flimsiest and most perfunctory character, and has resulted in the existence of irregularities of the gravest kind, without the knowledge of that Committee or of the Board, it is evident that reforms were and still are imperatively required."

Now, there is one point which I think worthy of the attention of this Committee, and that is the rate, which began at 3d. in the £ and is now 1s. I think that some limit ought to be fixed which School Boards could not exceed. When Viscount Cranbrook brought in the Free Education Bill the other day, in moving the Second Reading he said—

"The time has come when it will be necessary to put some stop on the amount which School Boards are to expend. This is absolutely necessary, or there will be a serious reaction, and education must suffer."

Now, I think that that is one of the points which this Committee could properly inquire into, because there is no doubt that if schools were properly conducted our rates would



not be so high. This is not a matter which concerns the rich people so much as the poor. It does not matter much to the rich man whether he pays a rate of 6d. or 1s.; but when we come to think of the poor shopkeepers who are only just able to make a living it is a very different thing, and I am quite sure that all over the Metropolis they must feel, when this robbery is going on, that it is very hard lines that they should be taxed to pay not only for education, but for waste and wrong. I am told that the present School Board are in favour of this inquiry, and that they hope by exposing the past to protect the future. I am told that they would like to have an inquiry into these matters themselves, but they are unable to do so because they have no power to get at information by calling witnesses or for documents from hostile persons, who naturally have all to conceal, and also have no power to take evidence on oath, and in addition to this they have the fear of libel actions before their eyes, which, even when successfully defended, are attended with great loss of time and money. This inquiry will bring out all the facts, and it is absolutely necessary to restore public confidence. I hope I have made out my case. I have tried to bring forward every fact fairly. I have documents here to prove everything I have mentioned, and, so far as I know, I have not exaggerated a single fact. I believe if this inquiry is held that it will bring out a mass of corruption that will astonish the people of London; and I think that if the effect of this is to bring down the rates the Government will have earned the gratitude of the people of London for having exposed what has been such a crying scandal, and having reduced the rates for them in the future. The reason for rooting up the past is that when a gross scandal like this has been exposed it prevents men in the future from doing such things. I do not want to ask for anything that the Government would not be justified in giving; but I think they will feel that the responsibility rests upon them of granting an inquiry of some sort or kind which the public expect and feel ought to be granted; and I think

it ought to strengthen their hands to have a request on the part of the School Board themselves that such inquiry should be held. I beg to thank the House for the very kind way in which it has listened to me. I have tried to take up as little time as possible. I have brought this matter forward as a simple public duty, and I hope the effect of what I have done will be for the good of this Metropolis. I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name.

(7.48.) MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Abercromby, Liverpool): I have much pleasure indeed in seconding the Motion. I did not come here to make a speech, but to listen to the speech of my hon. Friend which has been a most extraordinary *exposé* of bribery and corruption. I rose to-day, not as a London ratepayer, but, as the hon. Member has said, in the interest of the public. It is most desirable that it should be known over the length and breadth of the land that when public men, occupying public posts, undertake duties and do not discharge them honestly and fairly, sooner or later they will have to give an account before their constituencies. I think the Government ought to give this matter, now that it has been fairly brought before the House, most careful consideration; for it is quite certain that they will be liable to very adverse criticism if, having these facts fairly brought before them, they do nothing to make adequate inquiry. What I would strongly advise is that there should be an independent authority to make inquiry as to the past transactions and these matters referred to to-day, so that the country may have some guarantee that the matters have been fairly and judiciously considered. I am not by any means one of those that desire to economise money, and so stint education. Far from it, but as a ratepayer in favour of the best education for the people of England, I am anxious to see that when we do spend money, our money should be judiciously spent, and not improperly squandered. As I have said, I did not come here to make a speech and, therefore, I shall content myself with merely seconding this Motion.

*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the action and extravagance of the London School Board and the cause of the high rates raised for its use in the Metropolis."—(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland.*)

(7.50.) MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Poplar, Tower Hamlets): I trust the hon. Member will permit me to say that everyone will admit that the hon. Member, has brought forward his case with great moderation and great lucidity. I am not here to defend the School Board. It is some years ago since I had the honour of being a member of the Board, but I should like to make a few remarks on this subject. It would seem from the look of the Resolution that the hon. Member was going to speak, not so much about the malversation of the School Board as in reference to what is called the extravagance of the School Board. But he really said little in reference to that, and to a certain extent it is a subsidiary point, and a fact more for the ratepayers than for this House, and I will not allude further to this portion of the subject. But when he referred to the very high salaries of the teachers I think he forgot one or two points—namely, that in one respect, at all events, the London School Board compares favourably with other School Boards, that they are very much larger, that they have a poorer class of children in them, and that living in London is very much higher than anywhere else, and that the salaries are absolutely inclusive salaries, whereas in many other cases, in the provincial towns, the rent, and house, and light, are provided in addition to the salary. The hon. Member has made a very much more serious charge against the London School Board than extravagance. I think myself that in the case of the expenses incurred in respect of sites for buildings, &c., the School Board have a very good reply. But he has made other charges: that there

has been great maladministration and considerable corruption with respect to the work of the Board. I, for one, should be very glad if there has been corruption of the description he speaks of, that it should be made public, and not in any way hid by the School Board or any other Body. If corruption has taken place, let it be exposed to the light of day. But, in listening to the observations of the hon. Member, if he will allow me to say so, I think he has somewhat exaggerated the case he has made out. It seems to me, in reference to certain schools, he did not take the whole work of the Board, as he ought to have taken it, in bulk. He forgets that this representative Board, representative of the ratepayers, has its work extended over 20 years; that it has had about 400 schools, nearly, under its care, and about 500,000 children under its charge. I do not think that any past member of the Board would say that everything that the Board has done has been entirely free from mistake in every respect. I do not suppose any member would say that that or any other Board was infallible. The hon. Member referred to certain cases of certain buildings and certain sites. With regard to the question of buildings, there is this, I think, to be said, that when the Board was first brought into existence some 20 years ago, it was a question for them, should they hurry and struggle as quickly as possible, in order to supply the admitted deficiency in school accommodation with as little delay as possible. I think that in some cases they made rather too much speed in respect of the schools, and that in a very large number of cases the buildings were erected too quickly, and were not, therefore, as permanent or as efficient as they ought to have been. To the system of accepting the lowest tender for the erection of buildings much of the faulty construction must be ascribed. I have always felt in reference to the question of Government contracts and others, that the system of accepting the lowest tender quite irrespective of what was contained in that tender—quite irrespective of the firm itself—is not a system on which any Public Body ought

to act. I think we ought to remember that there has been a considerable amount of litigation in regard to these particular schools, and I believe that in no single case has the Board been able to justify its allegation that there had been fraud and corruption on the part of the builders. And further, I believe that in one or two cases, actions for libel have been brought by builders against members of the Board for making assertions the hon. Member has made this afternoon.

MR. DIXON HARTLAND: There have been actions for libel brought with respect to certain charges; but with respect to the charges which I have brought forward this afternoon, so far as I know, no actions for libel have been brought.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Well, I do not know, but with regard to some assertions, I believe that is correct. Not that I say that there has been no fraud on the part of the builders. I am sorry to say in my opinion there has been considerable fraud on the part of some of the builders. But I think that these loose assertions made in this House and in the School Board by certain Members are not altogether warranted by the facts of the case. I believe myself that while there is a considerable amount of truth in them, there is a considerable amount of exaggeration in them. I think the House should remember this, when they see the great cost the School Board has been put to in purchasing these sites that these sites have been bought by this Public Body after arbitration; and every one knows the tendency of juries to give as high a price as possible to the seller if a Public Body is one of the parties to the case. The result was that a very great number of most expensive sites had to be purchased. I think it ought not to go to the discredit of the School Board, because they were obliged to go where the children were, quite irrespec-

*Mr. Sydney Buxton*

tive of the price. I think it should also be remembered, as the hon. Member's own speech shows, that no matter what may have been the case in the past, at all events the present School Board is perfectly alive to its responsibilities. It is perfectly clear that the existing School Board ought to get at the bottom of all these frauds and this corruption if they existed. I think the mere fact that they have made an inquiry themselves show that they are in earnest in the matter. The hon. Member said just now that the present Board are in favour of a public inquiry. I may at once say that if the School Board by a considerable majority desire to have a public inquiry I should support that public inquiry. I cannot help feeling that nothing would be more fatal to the administration of our Public Bodies than inquiry by a Select Committee or a Royal Commission. It necessarily weakens their responsibility if they know that when they go wrong there will be such an inquiry. The hon. Gentleman said that millions had been spent on fraud and corruption. Does the hon. Member think that if he got this Commission those millions would reappear? The only thing this inquiry could do would be to give a warning to the School Board, which, it seems to me, the School Board does not require. The publicity given to this matter—and we are under an obligation to the hon. Gentleman for bringing his Motion forward—will be adequate for the purpose he has in view. I am with the hon. Member in saying that if there has been fraud and corruption it should be brought to light; but the School Board are making what I believe will be an effective inquiry, and I think we had better leave it there.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at ten minutes after Eight o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday, 2nd March, 1892.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.  
(No. 32.)

## SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

\*(2.10.) MR. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): This is a measure brought in in the interest of the restoration of social peace in Ireland: distinctly, it is a measure of peace. It deals with the case of a number of men who may be regarded as victims in the social struggle which has been going on in Ireland since 1879, and so long as these people are excluded from the benefit of the legislation which was induced in large measure by their sufferings, there can be no hope that perfect peace will be permanently restored in Ireland. The justice of the claim made originally by these men has been amply proved by the course of legislation which has been forced upon the House, by the numerous Acts which have been passed to deal with the inequalities, the injustices, of the law as it existed in 1879. Therefore we appeal with confidence to the justice of this House, and ask that these men shall not be exposed to the loss of their means of living—that they shall not be punished for having been the advance-guard of reforms, the justice of which has been acknowledged as necessary by the course Parliament has taken. This is a very modest Bill. It involves no new principle; but it extends the principle of Clause 13 of the Act of last year in a way that has been advocated in this House before, though it has not yet been adopted. The main object of the Bill is to give the tenants who are still out of their holdings the benefit of Clause 13, which was destined for them when the clause was proposed. The time for the application of that clause has expired, and we propose to extend it to the beginning of 1893. In addition to this prolongation of the

period of application, we propose that the principle of compulsion shall be applied, in a limited number of cases; and that there is necessity for this compulsion in the interest of the general peace of the country I think we shall be able to establish. We have no official data by which we can measure the benefit derived from Clause 13, but I have seen it stated with some authority that of the Ponsonby tenants, out of 214 evicted, 111 have settled under the clause. I do not know what reasons may have prevented agreements in the other cases, but these instances show that voluntary settlements were possible under the Act. Yet I hold in my hand a letter referring to another case, where it is shown that while the tenants are willing to come to a settlement the landlord—or in this the landlady—absolutely refuses to come to terms. The letter is from one of the tenantry on the celebrated Maroney estate in County Clare. In this letter the writer says—

“I conveyed to Mrs. Maroney the purport of your conversation with me on the 10th (this was in reference to the re-instatement of the tenant), but she declined absolutely to entertain the question of purchase or re-instatement.”

Now this landlady, Mrs. Maroney, has been under police protection some ten or more years, and she has been the cause of enormous trouble and has involved the county in enormous expense in order to support her in her frightfully unjust action towards her tenants, proved to be unjust, because when this lady has been brought before the Land Court the claims of the tenants have been justified by the decisions of the Court. It is in such cases as these that we want the law to step in and compel reasonable action. For reasonable landlords such an enactment is not required. The Bill further deals with cases where landlords have failed to effect voluntary sales by the end of 1893; then it gives power to the Land Commission to compel them to sell at a fixed price. In dealing with cases such as I have referred to, the Insurance Fund is done away with in order to somewhat lessen the cost of purchase. Another import-

ant part of the Bill is the clause directing the Land Commission to issue an order for the immediate entry of the evicted tenant to his holding. That deals with a thorny subject, and it is just as well that we should face it at once. There are a number of people who have entered into the homes of these men, and they will have to give up their farms, for I hold that they have no right to take possession of that which properly belongs to other men; anyhow, it belongs to them in equity and justice, though by the letter of the law they may be excluded. Without question, the intruders by some means or other must be made to give up the farms to the men to whom they belong. The House must face this question; it is a very important one, and until it is settled there can be no hope for any permanent peace in Ireland.

(2.20.) MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): In seconding the Motion of my hon. Friend for the Second Reading of the Bill, I shall endeavour to imitate his example, and be as brief as possible. I shall also endeavour to avoid as much as possible repeating what he has ably stated. My hon. Friend has stated in broad outline the main provisions of this Bill; but perhaps it may be well if, in somewhat greater detail, I touch on its provisions. The 1st clause in the Bill deals with the 13th section of the Act of last year, which enables voluntary sales and purchases to be effected between landlords and their evicted tenants. That section, we must all admit, has not led to any great results; but, at the same time, it has not wholly failed. The time for making arrangements under it has, as my hon. Friend has stated, now expired; it expired on the 6th of last month. We propose to continue it until the beginning of next year, and we propose to extend to the Land Judge the powers given by it to ordinary landlords, inasmuch as there are a few estates in the Land Judges' Court to which the clause may be applicable, and it has been held that the Land Judge does not possess the power which is given to the ordinary landlord under the 13th clause of the Bill of last year. We hope it may be more effectual if re-enacted than it has been up to the present, for

I confess that for myself I would prefer voluntary arrangements if they could possibly be effected, because I believe that in the long run they would be better for both parties. But there is no use in concealing from ourselves the fact that there are some landlords in Ireland who must be forced, in one way or other, to come to terms with their evicted tenants—Lord Clanricarde, for instance, will not yield except under direct compulsion, and we have heard from my hon. Friend that he has had a letter from Miltown Malbay showing that there is a female Clanricarde taking the same line. Other landlords, through a false pride, as I think, and under the influence of a class feeling, have declined to take a course which they consider as “knocking under to the Plan;” but I suspect these gentlemen would very gladly avail themselves of the opportunity offered them by legal compulsion to make peace. We propose now to apply to these two classes of landlords the same sort of compulsion as the Government itself last year applied to the landlords of the long leaseholders. We have direct precedent for the measure which we submit to the House to-day in the “Redemption of Rent Act” passed last year. Under that Act a tenant who has a lease in perpetuity, or even who holds on a fee-farm grant, is placed in this position: that he may propose to buy his holding under the Land Purchase Act; and if the landlord refuses to sell, or even if the landlord offers unreasonable delay to selling, then the contract is, *ipso facto*, broken, and the tenant is regarded as a present tenant, with the right to have his rent fixed in the usual way like any other tenant. Under the 3rd clause of this Bill an evicted tenant will be in precisely the same position as the long leaseholder under the Act of last year. These tenants may propose to buy their holdings under the Purchase Act at a price to be fixed, in the last resort, by the Land Commission; and then if the landlords refuse to sell to them, or if they offer unreasonable delay to selling, then, like the long leaseholders, they may go into Court and get fair rents fixed. That is the sum and substance of the 3rd clause, which I think is the most important in the Bill. Now,

Mr. O'Kelly

If this clause was equitable in the case of the long leaseholders, I cannot see how it can be unjust in the case of the evicted tenants. I do not know who can object to it in this House. The Government cannot object to it, for they have passed a Bill themselves based on the same principle. The hon. Member for South Tyrone has given notice to move the rejection of this Bill to-day, but I think he will be very inconsistent if he moves that Motion, because two or three years ago he himself proposed on behalf of the Clanricarde tenants a far more drastic measure—compulsory expropriation. I do not see how landlords can object. They cannot say that the Bill will do any injustice, or deprive them of anything whatever, except that which they ought not to possess, the power of disturbing peace and order in Ireland, or of preventing their re-establishment. We provide even that the landlords shall get their arrears of rent, or so much as the Land Commission—a tribunal packed with landlords—such arrears as that tribunal declares to be justly due to them; and the only deduction that will be made from the amount payable in the shape of arrears will be a sum representing the value of the buildings which, I am sorry to say, in a great many cases, landlords have razed to the ground, or otherwise destroyed, and which any Court of Equity, under ordinary circumstances, would compel them to pay for or to restore. Well, I do not see how they can object to the Bill on these grounds, and I pass on to the 4th clause. As my hon. Friend has frankly stated, it refers to a certain class of people who have grabbed some of these evicted farms. In the great majority of cases this clause will be useless, because the evicted lands are mostly vacant. But there are a few estates, I think not more than three or four altogether, on which there are bogus tenants, or people who are known as “planters”—persons who are not so much tenants paying rent, as caretakers, paid to take care of the places; paid, I fancy, not altogether out of the funds of the landlords themselves, but to some extent, and perhaps to a large extent, out of the abounding wealth of English gentlemen, like the

hon. Member for the Skipton Division (Mr. Walter Morrison), to act the part of scare-crows to the surrounding tenants, and an illustration of the danger that may be involved in invoking the wrath of an Anglo-Irish landlord combination. As regards these persons, I believe they, as well as the landlords, must be pretty sick of their respective positions; and I believe that if this clause becomes law the “planters” will immediately disappear, and will be very thankful to get off with any compensation that perhaps the hon. Member for the Skipton Division and others may be willing to give them. We propose that these “planters” shall be dispossessed at once by a vesting order made at the same time the rent is fixed, and the advantage of this arrangement is that it will save the long ejectment proceedings necessary if no such vesting order is made. The remaining provisions are intended to help the tenant when restored to his holding to pay his instalments of the purchase money in an easy fashion. These provisions are—we reduce the percentage to £3 15s., we also abolish, what we think ought to be abolished in the case of every purchase, the Insurance Fund payment, which would prevent him from getting for five years the full benefit of the Act. If there is a slight financial derangement in consequence, we balance that by the abolition of the county percentage, and we think the counties would be pleased to pay such a price for peace within their borders, and in my opinion it would be a good bargain for them to make. In brief, these are the provisions of the Bill. I do not think I have concealed a single provision of the Bill, and I believe the provisions are conceived in a spirit of equity, and certainly they are intended to bring to an end a state of things which neither the Government nor this House, nor the general community in Ireland, nor even the landlords, can possibly desire to see further prolonged. They may require amendment; possibly they do: we have not had the advantage of a Government draftsman; but if they are amended, and not emasculated, in Committee they will be effective for their purpose. For these reasons, and for those stated

by my hon. Friend, and feeling like him that unless the evicted tenants are restored to their homes there will not be peace in Ireland, as in my opinion there ought not to be peace, I join heartily with my hon. Friend in commending this simple and equitable measure to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(Mr. O'Kelly.)

\* (2.36.) MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): The hon. Member for Roscommon, in introducing it, described this as a modest Bill, and at all events it has one recommendation, that it is thoroughly candid and straightforward. Whether or not I am open to the charge of inconsistency, I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to move the rejection of the Bill, and I will do my best to state the reasons that actuate me. When the Land Purchase Act was passing through the House last Session there was a long discussion on the question of the evicted tenants, and much was said about them on both sides of the House, with the result that provisions were inserted in that measure from which I did not hope much at the time, and, therefore, I am not much disappointed at the results. But, at all events, it was an effort to give landlords and tenants breathing time, during which period they might come to terms, if they felt disposed to do so. Under Section 13 six months were allowed, and during that period landlords and tenants might agree as to terms of purchase under the Act which afterwards came into operation. I have said I did not hope for much from this section. I did not think the time allowed was too limited. I remember the hon. Member for West Belfast fought a great battle for a longer time. I did not disapprove of the length of time. My fear was as to the condition of the property, and the position of the evicted tenant, and I feared that under these circumstances if the landlord and ex-tenant came to terms the Land Commission would not ratify those terms, because of the lack of

Mr. Clancy

security—because of the state of the land and the condition of the farmer. So far as I can learn—and my only authority is the statement of the Chief Secretary, in answer to a question—very few applications have actually been made. But, although applications have not been lodged, I also gathered from the reply of the right hon. Gentleman that two months are allowed by the rules of the Commission for the lodging of applications, and in addition to those referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, I am aware that 104 of the tenants evicted from the Ponsonby estate have signed agreements to purchase. I am also aware that the entire tenantry on another Campaign estate have signed agreements.

MR. J. REDMOND: No; the arrangements have fallen through.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That was not so when I left Dublin recently.

MR. J. REDMOND: Yes; they have been withdrawn.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Well, I have heard of other attempts to arrive at agreements. I hope the Land Commissioners may see their way to ratify these agreements, and so end the state of affairs that prevail in some of these localities. But, candidly, I confess that, owing to the condition of the land and the position of these ex-tenants, I am not very hopeful that the Commissioners will decide there is security for the State for the advances under these conditions. Now as to the Bill itself. The first clause proposes to extend this period of six months. I cannot say that I have much objection to that, and I do not gather that the Government have much objection, for the Chief Secretary, answering a question from the hon. Member for North-East Cork, stated that if there was any desire on the part of landlords and tenants for an extension of time he was ready to consider a proposal of the kind. So I take it that to this first clause there will not be much objection on either side of the House. But when I come to the other clauses of the Bill I find radical objection to the whole of them. Clause 2 is the most innocent of all the enacting clauses of the Bill. It proposes that in the case of

estates in the Land Judge's Court—i.e., those practically in the hands of a Receiver—that the Land Judge shall have the power, if he think fit to exercise it, to re-instate any of these tenants who may have been evicted—a compulsory power being given to the land Judge. Well, if you are going to apply compulsion to these estates, what do you come to? I myself, in the course of discussions upon compulsory sale, have advocated that compulsion ought to be applied to all these estates, all these mismanaged estates, that have come into the Land Judge's Court. I have over and over again stated in Ireland that I thought compulsion might be applied to such estates. But in what position did I find myself placed? Tenants on well managed estates at once put the question to me, "Are you going to confer on the tenants on a badly managed estate this privilege of compulsory purchase, and yet withhold it from tenants on well managed or properly managed estates?" Well, I say, as an Ulster Member, I was not able to answer that, and I have reluctantly by my own constituents been driven out of the position I took up.

MR. O'KELLY: Make compulsion general.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: But I have sat in the House for six years, and I have never heard a proposal made in the House during all the discussions on land purchase in favour of compulsory purchase.

MR. SEXTON: There have been at least four such proposals.

MR. J. REDMOND: Such a proposal was made by the late Mr. Parnell.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes; but the hon. Member for Roscommon was not speaking of evicted tenants; he said make compulsion general.

MR. PINKERTON: I put down an Amendment to that effect.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: What is the use of putting an Amendment on the Paper and not being here to move it? The hon. Member for Roscommon said, in answer to my objection, "Make it general, and so get rid of the difficulty;" but I say the proposal has never been made with any authority in this House that there should be general compul-

sion, and when it is made I am ready to discuss it. But I am thankful to say that in Ulster the tenants do not, in the main, live on badly managed estates, and so they would be deprived of this privilege, and they would not tolerate it being withheld from them while it was conferred on the tenants on badly managed estates. The third is the most important clause in the Bill. It is quite true, as the hon. Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) says, that the clause proposes to apply the principle of the Rent Redemption Act to evicted tenants, and I ought to be the last man to throw a stone at the Rent Redemption Act. The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Balfour) will admit that in and out of season I pressed the principle of that Act upon his attention, and I greatly rejoice that it has become law, and I rejoice to find from the Returns it is not likely to be inoperative. But it is one thing to apply that principle to long leaseholders, tenants who have been struggling since 1881 to pay their rents, having been excluded from the Land Act; it is one thing to apply that principle, which, I admit, was a strong principle, to those tenants who have spent their capital on their holdings, in spite of the greatest difficulties; it is one thing to give a privilege like this to these men, and a totally different thing to give it to men who, according to the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), were able to pay their rent and would not. It is one thing to give it to long leaseholders who had claims on this House, and it is another thing to give it to evicted tenants who have no claim on this House, whatever claim they may have against hon. Members below the Gangway. Now, what is the proposal in this 3rd clause? It simply gives any evicted tenant since 1879 this right, if it becomes law, that he, being evicted, no matter under what circumstances—let the House mark that—no matter what the circumstances of the eviction were, if this were to become law, any evicted tenant, evicted since 1879, would simply have the right to come to his old landlord, and, whether the farm had been re-let or not, he could say—"I want this farm back, and I want you to sell



it, and if you cannot agree to my terms the Land Commission will fix terms, and if you will not sell, then your refusal to sell will constitute me a present tenant under the Act of 1881, and I shall go into the Court and have a fair rent fixed." Now, I think it must strike the House that is an extraordinary privilege to give to evicted tenants. It is conferring on them all the benefits of compulsory sale—benefits you withhold from the honest tenants who, amid the greatest depression and difficulties, struggled to pay their rent. You propose to reward the men evicted, it may be, under circumstances of sheer rascality on their part, with this great privilege which you withhold from the great mass of tenants who honestly struggled to pay their rent in times of the greatest depression. What defence is there for that? It is no argument to say we have applied that principle to the long leaseholders, the men who have striven to be honest under great difficulties. Even for them it was considered a strong order. I rejoice that they got it, and that the provision has not been inoperative. This clause goes further than that. The hon. Member implied that one reason why the 13th section of the Land Purchase Act had not been operative was that landlords had refused to come to terms. I know of one case where there was such a refusal.

MR. J. REDMOND: I know of 300.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: But let me put this case. I have seen a proposal made in writing by the tenants on a campaign estate in the South of Ireland, and I have seen the landlord's reply to that proposal. When I saw the landlord's answer to the proposal I said, and I say again, that the terms suggested by the landlord were impossible terms, and that the landlord might as well have asked the tenant to pay the National Debt. I admit that. I was asked to communicate with the landlord. I knew the landlord, and I had visited the estate in bygone years. I did communicate with the landlord, and what was his reply? I confess I had no answer to it. One of the conditions the

landlord sought to impose was that he should not be asked to leave the guarantee deposit. I thought at first this was a monstrous proposal; but how did the landlord justify it? He said—

"Mr. Russell, these tenants were well off, and they entered into a conspiracy to deprive me of my rent, and they did deprive me of a large sum. I had to evict them. What is the proposal now made? Should I agree to the terms of purchase, a fifth of the purchase money will be held as guarantee out of my portion; and what security have I that these men will not conspire again; and if they do, what happens? My fifth is the first thing to be seized. These men have conspired against me before, and why should I, of all men in the world, be security for them again? I who have been their victim?"

Candidly, I confess I had no answer to this. I mention this to show the difficulties landlords have in coming to terms under the 13th section as well as the tenants. Now, take a concrete case. What would be the position under this Bill? It is all very fine to talk about "planters." I do not believe that "planters" or tenants under that title are very numerous, or that it would be impossible to deal with such cases; but let me take a concrete case from the Lansdowne Estate. Lord Lansdowne was the landlord of the hon. Gentleman who represents one of the Divisions of Kerry. Lord Lansdowne has sold the farm, though the right hon. Member for Central Bradford (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) contradicted me when I made the statement last Session.

MR. SEXTON: It was not sold then.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: It was not sanctioned, but all the arrangements were made. The farm held by the hon. Member for Kerry passed into other hands by sale. It is not vacant; it is occupied by a new tenant, and it is proposed that after this new tenant has purchased under legislation passed by this House the hon. Member for Kerry shall have the right to go back and say to the new tenant, "You must clear out of this. I am the old tenant, and this clause gives me the right; here is a vesting order which evicts you and plants me." Now, that is a strong order for this House to make after having authorised

*Mr. T. W. Russell*

this tenant on the Marquess of Lansdowne's estate to purchase under the Act. We passed the Land Purchase Act, the Ashbourne Act, and under the authority of the Act the Marquess of Lansdowne sold the property and the tenant bought it. The transaction was sanctioned by the Land Commission, and I say it is a very strong order to ask the House to pass this clause and authorise the old tenant to go back and clear out this man who has actually purchased under the authority of legislation passed by Parliament. You may call this a modest proposal, and such is the character given it by the hon. Member for Roscommon—

MR. SEXTON: It is not in the Bill. It does not apply at all.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Then what is the meaning of Clause 4? I may be wrong in my reading of the Bill, but I cannot be wrong in my understanding of the explanation given in this House by hon. Members who say that the clause is specially applicable to what are called planters on these farms.

MR. SEXTON: Tenants.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: What is the difference in law between the tenant and the purchaser? There are but few English Members in the House just now, but fortunately there are two on the front Bench below me. Will they bestow a little thought upon this Bill? They were violent opponents of the Land Purchase Act of last Session, and on what grounds did they oppose it? Because they objected to imperilling British credit in the purchase of Irish land. They objected to the imperilling of British credit notwithstanding the checks and safeguards that almost every clause of that Act contains. Now let them look at this Bill. Here is a proposal which certainly imperils British credit, and what is your security? In the first place the land, much of which is derelict, out of cultivation, ruined. Not much security this. Next you have the security of ruined Campaigners who have been loafing about for six or seven years in Irish towns and villages and have not improved by that. Your Insurance Fund, which at all events was good for something, disappears, and it

is absolutely proposed under this Bill to give these men more favourable terms than under the original Act you gave to legitimate purchasers! What do English Members, who have previously objected to imperilling British credit with all the safeguards the Land Purchase Act contains, say to this Bill to-day, which imperils British credit and includes none of the safeguards the original Act possesses? I divide evicted tenants into four classes. The first class is those who may have been unjustly evicted. Now, my previous opinion with regard to the Clanricarde estate has been referred to here to-day. I have said over and over again that I consider the Marquess of Clanricarde a standing menace to the peace of the County of Galway, and I am not going to withdraw one step from that statement. I say there were tenants unjustly evicted, but I am bound to say that I cannot impeach the Marquess of having racked higher than his neighbours, or as high. I should be very glad if those tenants could be dealt with under Clause 13, or some extension of that clause. Then there are tenants who have been evicted and have been unfortunate, who have failed to make their land pay. The second class are the ne'er-do-wells. Why should you put them back into the farms and let them imperil the credit of the State when they could not make them pay when they were in them? The third class is those who conspired, at the bidding of a great organisation, not to pay their rent; who went out of their farms on a deliberate plan and system, the system being to produce anarchy in the country, and, though I have not the exact words, I remember the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) saying that the Plan of Campaign was not organised so much in view of the relief of the tenants as with the view of embarrassing the Government.

MR. J. E. REDMOND (Waterford): That is not what I said.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I said I had not the hon. Gentleman's exact words. And, lastly, there is another class, and I suspect the most numerous, the dupes of that great organisation, men who

went out after being told they would not lose a shilling, that the resources of the Irish race were at their back, these children of the nation who were never to be deserted, like the Tipperary tenants, who have left their homes and lost their all, and have never had the honour of even a passing visit from the hon. Members for East Mayo (Mr. J. Dillon) or North-East Cork (Mr. W. O'Brien) since they came out of gaol. I admit the misfortunes of these tenants, but I deny that they have any claim on this House. They derided the laws of this House, and trampled on the peace which those laws were intended to uphold. The people these men have claims upon are hon. Members below the Gangway, who urged them to leave their homes, and told them they would never desert them, and who, raising a fund for national purposes in the name of the evicted tenants, have applied some of it to a totally different purpose. I move the rejection of the Bill with a clear conscience, and if I said a word in support of a Bill like this, all I can say is that I should never stand face to face with the Ulster tenant farmers again, and in their name I move the rejection. It is not a modest Bill, but one of the most audacious that was ever presented to a British House of Commons.

MR. T. LEA (Londonderry, S.): I second the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(Mr. T. W. Russell.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

\*(3.10.) MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central): I find it difficult to reconcile the speech of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down with his action last year on the clause to which he referred. Though he claims credit for having passed the 13th clause last year, he says that he did not hope much from it, and that he has not been disappointed in its not having succeeded in effecting anything. My recollection of the speech of the hon. Gentleman on that occasion is exactly the reverse.

Mr. T. W. Russell

I find, on referring to *Hansard*, that on moving the clause he expressed his ardent hope that it would effect the purpose aimed at, and settle all the unfortunate disputes which had occurred on the Campaign estates. He expressed confidence that it would settle three-fourths of the disputes. He gave the House the express assurance that it would settle the disputes on the Olphert, Ponsonby, and Clongorey estates. I think his language to-day does not agree with what he said then, and three-fourths of the violent arguments he has used to-day would equally apply to the clause of last Session. The question before the House is one of very considerable importance and great delicacy and difficulty. I think there was a general desire in the House at the end of last Session that these disputes should be settled in an amicable manner in the interests of the peace of Ireland. I may remind the House that early in last Session I myself moved a Resolution for the purpose of endeavouring to effect this object. I proposed a Resolution to the House that the Government should use its influence with a view to restoring these evicted tenants to their holdings in the interests of the peace of Ireland, and with the view also of conciliating Irish public opinion, especially at a time when the Government was proposing a great remedial measure, and that, if necessary, it should adopt legislation with that object. The then Chief Secretary (Mr. A. J. Balfour) replied to me in what I may call the earlier tone of his Irish administration and made a violent speech in reply, in which he said if he were an Irish landlord he would rather beg his bread than give way to the tenants, who were in combination. Later in the Session more moderate counsels prevailed and better statesmanship, and in the course of the discussion which took place on the Land Purchase Bill the clause which has been alluded to was moved by the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) and generally accepted by the House. The Chief Secretary himself spoke in a totally different tone to that of the earlier speech, and expressed great pleasure in giving his support to the

clause. He said that if he were an Irish landlord he would be glad, even at a pecuniary loss, to re-instate the evicted tenants in the interests of peace. He also said that no one more than he desired that there should be a settlement of these disputes. These were wise and statesman-like words. The hon. Member for South Hunts (Mr. Smith-Barry), speaking for the landlords of Ireland, also expressed approval of the clause, and said that it would open the door to friendly settlements, and he believed would have the effect of settling a great proportion of the disputes. What has been the result? I am bound to say that it has been an almost total failure; practically no action has taken place under it. So far from the hopes and expectations of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) being fulfilled, I find that, on the three estates he mentioned, very little has been done.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: On the Ponsonby estate the settlements amounted to half the rents.

\*MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: I am coming to that shortly. The great bulk of the landlords on whose estates evictions had taken place had made no proposals to their tenants. The tenants had been most anxious for a settlement, and had done their very best to induce the landlords to offer them terms. In other cases the landlords made offers of such a character that it could not be expected for a moment that the tenants would avail themselves of them. What was the case of the Olphert estate? The evicted tenants, 340 in number, approached their landlord through Father Boyle, the curate of Falcarragh, and asked for terms of purchase. Colonel Olphert, in reply, said he was prepared to sell his lands if the tenants would pay in cash at once a sum representing the rent of the three years they had been out of possession, and also 20 years' purchase of the land. I venture to say that these terms were practically prohibitive, and could only have been brought forward in the belief that they would prevent further negotiations. What was the case on the Ponsonby estate? I know

something about it, for I have had communications from the excellent priest, Canon Keller, of Youghal. The offer made by the hon. Member for South Hunts (Mr. Smith-Barry)—who acts as chairman of the syndicate which has taken over this estate—I am sorry to say, hardly carried out the promise of his speech in the House. One would have expected that he would be one of the first to consider the subject in a conciliatory manner and offer reasonable terms. What were the terms offered by the hon. Member on the Ponsonby estate? They were asked to pay 19 years' purchase of their holdings, and to give promissory notes for one and a half years' rent, making about 20 years' purchase, which is considered to be an altogether unreasonable price. It is perfectly true that 102 out of 240 tenants have accepted these terms, but I am told that they accepted them under a feeling of panic, and in the hope that the Land Commission will not consent to such excessive terms. The remaining 140 tenants have rejected them. Under those terms the landlord would receive £20,000 more for the whole estate than Mr. Ponsonby was ready to accept, and had offered to the tenants to accept, three years before. That offer could hardly be said to be in the spirit of the clause of the Act of last year. So far as I have been able to learn, in the other cases no practical result has been arrived at. It does appear to me that the House having inserted this clause in the expectation that settlements would be arrived at, and having gone so far as to recognise the fact that the State credit might be used for the purpose of reinstating these tenants in their holdings, it is hardly satisfactory that the House should leave the question in its present state. Something more ought to be done towards carrying out that policy. I do not say that the measure before us is the best way of carrying it out; perhaps some better method might be devised for effecting the object. But it appears to me that the House is pledged to the policy of reinstating these tenants in their holdings. The present Chief Secretary (Mr. Jackson) spoke on the subject some nights ago in very

proper terms, and expressed an earnest hope that a settlement might be arrived at on the whole of the estates. Now there is an opportunity for the House to do that. The adoption of the Second Reading of this Bill will not pledge the House to the details as to how the proposal shall be carried out. By reading it a second time we adopt the principle that settlement ought to be brought about, and that these tenants should be reinstated, leaving the question as to how it shall be done for discussion in Committee. Practically the clause of last year has failed; the object the House had in view has not been carried out, and the opportunity now arises when the House may give some effect to the clause of last year, with the view of bringing about that result which Members desired last year, and which I believe they still desire. I do not think it necessary to follow the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) in his violent attacks on the tenants. I think the general disposition of the House last year was to forget what had been done in the past, and in the interests of peace, and in deference to the public opinion of Ireland, to bring these disputes to a conclusion. I venture to ask the House not to depart from that spirit—not to rake up old questions as to how far the tenants were justified or not in their combinations, but to look at the question from a statesmanlike point of view, and in deference to the public opinion of Ireland, which has been expressed on behalf of these tenants in a way in which it has never been expressed on any other question before the House, to take this opportunity of affirming the principle that a settlement should be arrived at on this important and difficult question. With a view to securing the peace of Ireland this is a time to make another effort to effect what was decided upon last year, and so bring these unfortunate disputes to a close.

(3.20.) Mr. W. O'BRIEN (Cork Co., N.E.): The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) has treated us to one of those attacks on the position of the evicted tenants in Ireland which he has hawked about

England for the last two or three years, with the result to the Tory Party that he has changed their solid base of 100 into 25. The Rossen election is, perhaps, the best proof the English people have begun to praise the value of the hon. Member's misinterpretation of the character of the fight we have been making in Ireland. That fight is for the peace of Ireland, and the reinstatement of these evicted tenants. When the Bill of 1887 was introduced it promised again and again to drop the Plan of Campaign if only the evicted tenants, whose sacrifices won that Plan, were admitted to its benefits. The Government deliberately excluded them, and that is the origin of the whole of the trouble in Ireland. That is the struggle has been prolonged four years with results that are slightly less agreeable to hon. Gentlemen supporting the Government than they are to hon. Gentlemen on this side. The result of our fight has been that, in five years of coercion, the Government were forced, in the 13th clause, to attempt to make some provision for the restoration of these evicted tenants, but it was, as usual, imperfect, utterly unworkable, and simply enabled one or two men like the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. Smith-Barry) to use the credit of the British taxpayer as he almost admitted, to coerce the tenants. If the Government are satisfied with this result of the five years' struggle to deny these unfortunate men justice they are thankful for such mercies. You have not broken the Plan of Campaign, but it has broken you. It has accomplished the object for which it was put forward. It has wrung two Acts from the Government. It victoriously protected these evicted tenants year after year in face of the most fierce coercion. We have deserted the evicted tenants; we are here still; and though the hon. Member may taunt us that the Unholy Divisions which paralyse for the moment our power in Ireland have increased and aggravated our difficulties—we have not abandoned a single evicted tenant and we will not abandon a single tenant until you have either passed

*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*

this measure or a General Election gives us the power of obtaining a just and effective 13th clause instead of the miserable and abortive clause of the Land Purchase Act of last year. I most cordially support the Bill, and warn you that if you do not pass it to-day, you will have to pass it some day.

\*(3.27.) MR. BARTON (Armagh, Mid): I do not think the House will blame the hon. Member for speaking with some warmth on this subject, but I desire to say a few words on the speech of the right hon. Member for Central Bradford, who is himself, we might almost say, a supporter of the Plan of Campaign. He went over to Ireland and took part in meetings and transactions in connection with the Plan of Campaign. I have no sympathy with the English Privy Councillor who becomes an Irish agitator. Irish Members cannot approach this question with a light heart. Landlords who have been the victims of the Plan of Campaign have been reduced to want, and their servants and dependants thrown out of employment. We cannot help sympathising also with the tenants who have been the dupes of designing politicians. Some of them have had to leave the country, and others have spent their time in the public houses in the neighbourhood of their old homes, losing all their habits of agriculture and of labour, so that if they are re-instated they will never be in the same position as formerly. The voluntary clause in the Bill introduced last Session was a fair clause, and I believe was an immense step towards conciliation. But as for the present Bill it is quite a different matter. It offers a premium upon lawlessness and dishonesty, for it proposes to give special and peculiar privileges and rewards to tenants whose conduct has certainly not entitled them to any special consideration. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has said that he would not take up matters connected with the origin of the Plan of Campaign. I dare say if the right hon. Gentleman could have foreseen the results of that Plan, and could recall the last few years, he would have taken a very different view of the matter, and might,

in all probability, have spared himself the cost of sundry return tickets to Ireland. I hope the House will pardon me for referring to a speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian as to the Plan of Campaign. Speaking in Scotland, the right hon. Gentleman said—

"I believe I am right in saying that the Plan of Campaign has been declared by sufficient authority not to be legal, and I do not justify anything that is not legal."

I admit that the right hon. Gentleman went on to attribute the Plan to the policy of the Tories. But this suggestion has been recently denied on the best authority. Now, Mr. Andrew Kettle, one of the promoters of the Land League, writing on the 27th October, 1891, to the *Irish Times*, says—

"It may surprise some people to learn that the Plan of Campaign was not started by Mr O'Brien to settle the Land Question, or to work out the social emancipation of the tenants. It was promoted by a desire to make good Mr. Gladstone's words, that the Tories would have to govern Ireland either by Coercion or Home Rule, and as there was very little chance of the latter contingency the Plan was started. To force the Tories to pass a Coercion Act? The tenants and the Land Question were only means to an end."

MR. W. O'BRIEN: Mr. Andrew Kettle is a very respectable man; but he has no special knowledge of the causes that led to the establishment of the Plan of Campaign.

MR. BARTON: The hon. Member should have heard me out. This Mr. Kettle was one of the founders of the League. But I do not solely rely upon Mr. Kettle's statement. In a recent speech the hon. Member for Waterford said, in reference to the Plan of Campaign—

"It was not simply started as an agrarian movement; it was started as a great political engine wherewith to fight Balfour and to fight Coercion."

But if the Plan of Campaign was a political engine why this Bill? If that is true, the promoters of the Bill are proposing to reward those who worked this great political engine "to fight Balfour and Coercion," and worked it for political purposes. This is a Bill meant to confer special privileges upon men whose policy was condemned by the Pope, condemned by the Judges,

and condemned by statesmen and by the Press. The *Daily News* wrote as follows:—

"We by no means approve of Mr. Dillon's policy. His 'Plan of Campaign' seems to be vitiated with dishonesty. To withhold just rents because exorbitant demands are made is to take trouble to be in the wrong. The scheme which our special correspondent describes is one which attempts to cure a grievance of the tenants by inflicting a grievance on the landlords. It is doing an injustice as a protest against injustice."

As I have said, the Plan of Campaign was condemned by the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, the following question having been proposed to their Eminences the Cardinals of the Congregation:—

"Is it permissible, in the disputes between landowners and tenants in Ireland, to use the means known as the Plan of Campaign and boycotting? After long and mature deliberation their Eminences unanimously answered in the negative and, the decision was confirmed by the Holy Father."

Such was the decision of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, and yet, for political purposes, the Rescript of the Pope was treated as so much waste paper. Again, the question came before the Courts of Law, and the Lord Chief Baron—dealing with this matter, which, according to the *Daily News*, was "vitiated with dishonesty"—in his charge to the jury in the case of *Blunt v. Byrne*, laid it down as a matter of law, deliberately and without any reservation, that—

"The Plan of Campaign is, in its essence, against the spirit of personal liberty, is against the law of the realm, and anyone taking part in it, aiding it, or promoting it, is guilty of an offence for which he may be made criminally responsible."

That judicial deliverance has never been dissented from by any member of the Judiciary in either England or Ireland. It will surely be difficult for hon. Members opposite who are not Nationalists to support a measure meant to give exceptional privileges to the tenants on the Campaign estates, when their only claim to exceptional treatment is that they have taken part in a course of action which the right hon. Member for Midlothian has himself refused to justify, which the heads of the Roman Catholic Church have so emphatically condemned, which the Judges of

the land have declared to be illegal. But if this was the way in which the Plan of Campaign was initiated, how was it carried on? Was it conducted with a desire to arrive at settlements? Not at all. It will, I dare say, be in the recollection of hon. Members that, with regard to one estate upon which the Plan of Campaign was put in force, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Limerick wrote a letter, in which he almost prayed that a settlement might be come to. I will read the last sentence of that letter—

"It would be easy for me to win popularity by taking another course, but even if higher motives did not restrain me, I should be ashamed to ask poor people to endure heart-breaking sorrows of eviction which I had no notion of ever undergoing myself."

But how was that letter referred to in the House of Commons by the hon. Member for East Mayo? The hon. Member, speaking of the letter of the Bishop of Limerick, described it as "a most violent and dastardly letter," and said that the Bishop's conduct was "scandalous." He said—

"I am exceedingly glad that he stands alone among the Episcopacy of Ireland with his scandalous conduct."

Remarks of that kind throw an illuminating ray upon the manner in which the fight has been kept up, and shows that the aim of the promoters of the Plan of Campaign was to keep a festering sore open as long as they could, and not to heal it. Hon. Members opposite suggest that they, at any rate, have done nothing to prevent the clause which has already been referred to from working; but I regret to be compelled to say that my observations of the public utterances of hon. Members in Ireland have led me to form quite a different opinion. It is true that the hon. Member for Waterford, speaking on the 14th September of last year, said—

"What, in my opinion, should be done is this. There are many estates where reasonable settlements could be brought about, and where tenants might be restored at reduced rents, and I would say that the tenants upon such estates might be allowed to accept those settlements."

But how, I ask, was that received? Why, it was denounced as a most cowardly policy, and in proof of that

Mr. Barton

I may be allowed to quote from a speech of the hon. Member for North East Cork, who, alluding to this advice of the hon. Member for Waterford that settlements should be made where possible, said—

"For what does Mr. Redmond's policy mean? Mr. Redmond puts a pistol to the heads of the Clanricarde tenants and says: 'You must surrender at discretion to Lord Clanricarde. You must throw yourself at the mercy of a ravening wolf, and if you do not, I will take care that you do not get another shilling to keep you and your children from starvation.'"

And now, what is the House asked to do? It is asked to put the men who entered into that criminal conspiracy in a position of advantage to which the rest of the tenants of Ireland could never hope to attain. What about the tenants who resisted the Plan of Campaign? What about those honest men who, in spite of the combination, remained on their holdings and went on paying their rent? Are the men who defied the law to be brought in and given privileges that the honest tenants never asked for, never dreamt of, and which they could not hope to obtain? In August of 1887 the hon. Member for East Mayo gave a remarkable warning to those honest tenants which I may venture to quote to the House. Speaking on the 23rd August of that year, he said—

"I am alluding now to the combination amongst the tenants known as the Plan of Campaign. Now let me say this: that if there be a man in Ireland—and I do not believe there is—if there is a man in Ireland base enough to back down, to turn his back on the fight, now that Coercion has passed, I pledge myself in the face of this meeting that I will denounce him from public platforms by name, and I pledge myself to the Government that, let that man be whom he may, his life will not be a happy one, either in Ireland or across the sea, and I say this with the intention of carrying out what I say, and without the slightest fear of the interpretation which will be put upon what I say by the Tory newspapers."

This Bill proposes that the men who have defied the law should be given privileges that those honest tenants, who resisted temptations and threats, never asked and do not now claim. But what about the men who have availed themselves of the Act of 1891? They have availed themselves of that Act, and yet they are to be placed in a worse posi-

tion than those who declined to do so. The hon. Member for South Tyrone is quite right when he said that the farmers of Ulster regard this Bill with considerable curiosity. They are men who paid their rents regularly, and frequently legislation has come in which did them no good, but which favoured the less deserving tenants in other parts of the country. [An hon. MEMBER: Name.] I refer, for example, to the Arrears Act as a specimen of the legislation which, I care not who brought it in, rewarded the landlord who managed his estate badly and the tenant who did not pay his rent. The question involved in the Bill before the House concerns, more than any section of the House, the Members on the Front Opposition Bench. Nobody can, of course, blame Irish National Members opposite for defending the evicted tenants. They would be, indeed, wanting in honour if they did not; they would be wanting in honour if they deserted the men who kept up the fight; and, so far as I know, they are not wanting in courage to stand by those who agree with them in Ireland. But it is quite different with hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The misery of the evicted tenants really lies at their door, and now they are in a dilemma. They must either desert their dupes—the men who kept up the fight in Ireland, and without whom they would have found it absolutely impossible to suggest that the present Government have had any difficulty in governing Ireland; or, in the alternative, they will have by supporting this Bill to sanction, to justify, and to reward a course of illegal criminality which I challenge hon. Members and right hon. Members opposite to defend upon Liberal principles.

(3.53.) MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has treated us to a considerable deal of ancient history which has often before been referred to both in and out of this House, and into which I have no desire and no intention of following him. In the course of his speech I could not help thinking that I had listened to similar speeches before in Ireland, and I could not help imagining



myself in the dock in Green Street, with the hon. Member engaged in conducting the prosecution. Hon. Gentlemen upon the other side of the House look, I think, upon the whole subject from a very narrow point of view. They hark back to the Plan of Campaign and to various organisations and agitations which it is impossible in the limits at the disposal of the House to go into, but which have for the last ten years been agitating Ireland. The hon. Member treats these matters as if they had not been again and again debated in this House; and he asks the House to believe that these agitations in Ireland arose from no cause whatever except from a desire to give assistance to the Liberal Party and to make political capital for them. The hon. Member charges the National Party in Ireland with having started the Plan of Campaign in Ireland for the simple purpose of making political capital for the Liberals in England, and for the purpose of proving that the English Government in Ireland was impossible. I can speak as to my own intentions, and I say, speaking for myself, that I do not believe there is in the House, or in the country, a man, who knows anything at all about the matter, who believes in his heart the truth of the statement. In the autumn of 1886 when the Bill of my late leader, Mr. Parnell, was rejected, I told the House that we would be obliged to fall back on the methods of agitation, which alone, in the past, have stood between the Irish tenantry, and which have wrung from successive English Governments large measures of concession. The hon. Member opposite talks about the grievances of the Ulster tenants. Why, nobody knows better than the hon. Member for South Tyrone that there is not a single benefit gained by the tenants of Ulster that has not been won by the sacrifices of the poor people whose rights the Irish National Members have been advocating. He and others might talk in this House until their hair grew grey, and I doubt if they would have got very much by their talking or that a single one of their grievances would have been listened to, much less remedied. Those very combinations,

*Mr. J. Dillon*

which are a constant mark for the denunciations of the hon. Members were, I take leave to say, the only root and source of every small concession gained for Ireland; and but for these very combinations the tenants of Ulster, in whom the hon. Member opposite professes to be so interested, would be still groaning beneath the heel of the landlord classes. We say that never, in the whole history of civilised mankind, has there occurred so great an alteration in the social condition of a country with so little bloodshed and disturbance as that which has marked the change that has come over the condition of the people of Ireland during the last ten years, and which I say was brought about by one of the greatest and, I will add, one of the most beneficial agitations that is known to history. There have been great combinations and great breaches of the law, if you will, but look back over the pages of history and point out to me any parallel instance where a whole people, who were practically in the position of serfs in the land, emancipated themselves, or to a great extent emancipated themselves, without some breaches of the law. I say there is no other country which has achieved so great results with so little disturbance, bloodshed, or breaches of the law; and because of one great combination a number of poor men, no matter whether they belonged to the Plan of Campaign or not—and the large majority of these men, I believe, did not belong to the Plan of Campaign, because there are only about 1,500 tenants on my book who did take part in the Plan of Campaign; so that the 5,000 or 6,000 tenants who would take advantage of this Bill can never have belonged to the Plan of Campaign. But whether they belonged to the Plan of Campaign or not, whether from lapse of time or from one cause or another, they have been shut out from the benefits which all the other tenantry of Ireland to-day enjoy. I do not mean to say that they enjoy all the benefits to which they are justly entitled, or anything like it, and I hope something more will be done for them before long; but these men for whom we now appeal, and for whom benefit this Bill has been introduced to—

day to save them from starvation and pauperism, have been shut out from the benefits which the law, as altered now by our exertions and agitation, confers upon every tenant to-day. And what we claim for these men is not, as the hon. Member falsely assures the House, that these men should be rewarded for a breach of the law. What we claim is, practically speaking, that a great amnesty of liberty should be extended to these people; that the voice of Justice, backed up by strong agitation—and it is worthless without that—the English Government, having been compelled by these two great forces to admit that the tenantry and the people of Ireland have been subjected for generations to a cruel and shameful wrong, they should undo that cruel and shameful wrong so far as in them lies. These poor tenantry are presumably—I say presumably, for the burden of proof lies on the other side—were unjustly evicted, because they were evicted from their holdings at a time when the law was unjust. Therefore I am entitled to say they were unjustly evicted. The law was unjust; you have altered the law, and the presumption is that before the law was altered the landlords used their powers of eviction unjustly. Our case, then, is that the tenantry evicted during the last ten years probably were unjustly evicted; and, in view of the great changes that have been wrought and the great ameliorations introduced into the law as affecting the position of the tenants in Ireland, I say it is not unreasonable, but reasonable and just, that some great measure of amnesty and healing should be extended to these tenants who, through the opposition and delay which the Irish Members experienced in carrying a measure of justice through this House, have been thrown out of their holdings and obliged to starve. I have only one word more to say, and it is this: over and over again we have warned this House and warned Governments of the danger of neglecting measures of this character, and in no instance that I can recollect have our words of warning been falsified. On the contrary, our position turned out in the main to be true. I ask the Government, and I ask this

House, do they desire to have social peace in Ireland? and I ask them do they expect to have social peace in Ireland while four or five thousand tenants claim permission to regain possession of their farms, and four or five thousand half-starved families are watching those farms and determined to come back? You may think, or pretend to think, that it is not just that these families should get back to their holdings; but the question is, what do the people of Ireland think? It is not what the Members of this House think that will prevail. What must ultimately prevail is what the moral sentiment of the people of Ireland thinks. Though our ranks may be divided, and although, unhappily, things have occurred in Ireland which have weakened our position in that country, and incited landlords to act harshly and unjustly towards their tenants, that state of things will not last for ever; and the time will come again when the moral sentiment of the people of Ireland—as regards five-sixths of the people—will be able to re-assert itself through a unanimous Party with the same force as during the last ten years that have rolled by. It is not, therefore, what this House may say that will ultimately prevail, but what the people of Ireland with one united voice may say; and the time will come, be it sooner or later, when they will reinstate these evicted tenants in their farms.

\*(4.6.) COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I do not intend to follow the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in what he has said touching the moral sentiment of the people of Ireland. On that question the hon. Gentleman is an undoubted authority, because for the last five or six years he has been forming and cultivating that sentiment which he is pleased to call moral. He has complained that the view taken by hon. Members on this side of the House has been a narrow one—that it has been confined to the tenants who took part in the Plan of Campaign, and to these only. I do not intend to emulate him in that respect, and in the few remarks that I shall make I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to break fresh ground. Now the hon. Member who introduced this Bill told us that it

was a modest Bill; but he also told us that it was not a new principle. As to whether it is a modest Bill or an audacious one I think there will be a considerable division of opinion; but as to whether it is a new principle or not, I am perfectly certain there can be no question of this, because the principle that underlies this Bill is the same as underlay nine-tenths of the Bill on the same subject which have emanated from the same quarter. That principle in some cases was veiled confiscation; in the present one it is confiscation absolutely unveiled and unvarnished. The hon. Gentleman said that there were only 1,500 tenants on his book as evicted tenants under the Plan of Campaign, or about one-third. How about the other two-thirds? Admitting, for argument's sake, that the former were arbitrary, what evidence have we that the evictions of the other two-thirds were in any way harsh or unjust? There were men in possession of the farms from which these tenants were evicted for breach of their legal engagements, these men, now in occupation, for many years—some ten or twelve years—have been cultivating these holdings, putting them in order, making up for the loss of time, want of energy and application, which caused the failure of the previous tenants; and they are by a process, which is euphemistically called a vested order, to be chucked out upon the road, and have all their improvements confiscated without the slightest compensation. But there are other instances. Of course, a landlord is not to expect any possible mercy from hon. Members opposite. ("Oh, oh.") Well, is he?

MR. SEXTON: Certainly.

COLONEL WARING: When is he to have mercy?

MR. SEXTON: When he deserves it.

COLONEL WARING: When he deserves it? Well, take the instance of a landlord who has been obliged to evict a tenant who is hopelessly insolvent and idle, and suppose he takes that farm into his own hands, cultivates the farm, puts it in order, repairs the buildings, erects a new one, and is making a profit out of that farm—is he to be evicted by a vested order?

*Colonel Waring*

Are his improvements to be confiscated without any return? We are told that if he pulls the house down, if he clears off a mud cottage, he has to pay for it, and I presume if he built an additional house and put it in order for a man to live in, he would be turned out of that without mercy or one farthing's compensation. I will give an instance of that; I shall not enter into particulars; I shall simply say that I myself have got a farm of the kind, out of which I am able to make more than double the rent I was ever paid for it; and I do not think that it would recommend itself to the justice of English Members that I should be turned out of that farm.

MR. DILLON: Where is the tenant?

COLONEL WARING: Gone to America. I heard the other day he had come back again, and I believe he is doing very well.

DR. KENNY: How much was he rack-rented?

COLONEL WARING: He was so rack-rented that I am making double the rent of the farm that he promised to pay me, but never did pay me. But suppose another case. Suppose I let a farm from which some other people have been evicted to an improving tenant, what are you to do with that man? We have great sympathy for a man who has brought eviction upon himself. Here is a man who acts under the law, has not in any way transgressed the orders of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who simply takes a farm in open market on the faith that the law of the land under which he has lived will be maintained. Are you to say to him because, in other parts of Ireland, there has been a collision of interests and some of our friends have gone to the wall, you are to be turned out of your home and have all your improvements for the last fifteen years confiscated? We were told that a precedent was made for this Bill under the Act passed last year for breaking perpetuity leases. But under that Act nobody could be evicted, and consequently the result was that no such injustice could possibly take place. We are told that this Bill is intended for peace, but I fail to see where the

war is. There was war, was disturbance certainly, in Ireland; but, so far as I can judge, the only war that is going on in Ireland now is between hon. Members opposite themselves. We were told by the hon. Member who brought in this Bill that we should have universal compulsion by way of getting rid of rent altogether. Where are hon. Members going to get the money to carry out this compulsory purchase? Hon. Members opposite know that they have strained their own consciences to the uttermost in voting 33 millions last year. Call it by its proper name—not compulsion, but confiscation—at once. I can read no other meaning in this Bill but an absolute confiscation. The real object of the Bill is not the reinstatement of the evicted tenants, but the destruction of the class to which I belong, and the throwing out of employment of the labourers and artisans who depend on it and support it against their machinations.

(4.50.) Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): The hon. and gallant Gentleman who has just sat down was pleased to refer to what he calls the war among the Irish Members. I venture to say that he has dignified it by too military a term. At any rate, I think the hon. and gallant Gentleman will find out in the long run that they are able to settle their disputes among themselves without any assistance from the hon. and gallant Gentleman or his friends. The hon. and gallant Gentleman, in my experience, rarely says anything of light and leading in a matter of large scope. The hon. and gallant Gentleman is too reminiscent. He ventured to sneer at my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo because of what he called his occupation. The particular occupation in which my hon. Friend has been engaged for many years of his life, and in pursuit of which he has uncomplainingly suffered the loss of liberty many times in the course of the last few years, has been an attempt—the noblest that any Irishman could make—an attempt to render Ireland a tolerable dwelling-place for the people, an attempt to save the mass of the Irish people from oppression, and it ill lies in the mouth of the hon. and gallant Gentleman to sneer at the

occupation of my hon. Friend, because the gallant Gentleman belongs to a class of men who have more grossly and shamefully abused their powers than any class of men of whom mention is made in the history of the world, and who, as is proved by the records of the Queen's Courts in Ireland, have made themselves the curse of Ireland and the disgrace of the Empire. The gallant Gentleman asks, is a landlord to expect no mercy? If political justice were to be meted out to these Irish landlords, they need expect no mercy—they deserve none. But we, the most extreme advocates of the Irish tenants, are disposed to be more lenient to them, and from beginning to end of this Bill there is no proposal which denies justice or mercy to the Irish landlord; because there is no proposal in the Bill to commit his financial interests to any other than his own friends. Every proposal in this Bill refers the rent to be paid to the landlord, or the value of his interest, in case of purchase, to a Commission composed of landlords and their friends; and does the hon. and gallant Gentleman seriously contend that a question referred to Mr. Wrench, Mr. Lynch, and Mr. Justice Bewley is likely to be determined against the interests of the landlord? The gallant Gentleman asks what compensation a landlord is to have for improvements. Well, the Bill provides that the Land Commission shall fix the price if the landlord and tenant cannot agree; and if they were to sell that farm as it suited themselves, in that case any improvements which the gallant Gentleman—entirely against the rule of his class in Ireland—has made, of course would be valued and included in the purchase-money. It is much to be regretted that on a great question of State policy of this kind, which has been the subject of angry strife between Parties in this House, it is so difficult to introduce anything like a spirit of calm and impartial statesmanship, and that there is so fatal a tendency to look at the subject from the point of view of the landlord. The Government, in this case, I fear, are ill-inclined, and certainly they have a bad adviser. The evil genius in this

case is the hon. Member for South Tyrone. I am sorry to say that I believe the hon. Gentleman has what I may call a vested interest in the perpetuation of ill-will. He has spoken to-day of funds, and has suggested that they were misappropriated. The hon. Gentleman seems to be sorry that there is a fund for the evicted tenants. He seems to be sorry that there is any hope that during this—

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I said that there were funds, and that all that I was sorry for was that they were not applied for the purpose, but for general purposes.

MR. SEXTON: The hon. Gentleman, by way of explanation, has made his position no better. The purposes of the National funds were stated with undeniable clearness and fulness by the Convention that was held in Ireland. These purposes were accepted, and are accepted, by the Irish people, and the main purpose to which the greater part of these funds has been applied is to the aid of these tenants. What right has the hon. Gentleman to speak of funds? Has the hon. Gentleman himself had no connection with funds? He has been connected with the fund for the squatters in Ireland, which was collected in England. He made himself cashier and treasurer of that, and he has published no audit of it to show how it has been applied. He blames us for encouraging hope in the breasts of the evicted tenants. What right has he, by means of this fund, to implant in the bosom of these squatters—

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I never got a penny of it.

MR. SEXTON: Surely he has. Evidence was given before the Courts in Ireland, and it was sworn that he gave £100 to one tenant.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Tipperary fund was a fund got up in relief of boycotting. The fund which the hon. Member is referring to is a fund for the derelict land; the fund for Tipperary has been dispensed there; it has been audited, and those who subscribed to it have got information of what was done with it.

MR. SEXTON: If the hon. Member could produce the audit hon. Members

would be better able to follow the distinction, which is not observable in this Debate. When the hon. Gentleman makes himself cashier of a fund collected in England, and has had an audit to show how it has been disposed of, especially when he makes himself trustee for these squatters—when the hon. Gentleman is in a fiduciary position with regard to this fund—I have good reason to say of him, as he has said of us with regard to the Plan Campaign tenants, that he has entered into a conspiracy in which the other parties are these poor squatters; and am entitled to assume, and I do assume that this hon. Gentleman has entered into obligations and incurred responsibilities according to which he stands discharged from the functions of a Member of the House.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I have no Sir.

MR. SEXTON: The hon. Member has been cited again and again in the House—and it has not been denied—the squatter's friend.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I again say that with these planters I have had no relations whatever.

MR. SEXTON: I again say that the persons connected with this fund had published an audit of it, that would be in a better position. The hon. Gentleman has acted as intermediary, in some sense, between those who contributed these funds in England and those who received them in Ireland. I think it would have been more judicious of the hon. Gentleman—instead of planning ill-will in Ireland and setting up a title to these evicted farms, which is incompatible with social interests—if he applied himself to aid in the application for the healing policy cited to-day. I say the hon. Gentleman is a bad adviser, and the evil genius in this case. I fear I must add that the Government themselves are ill-inclined. A heavy responsibility lies upon them. They were warned in 1886—the year for entering into peace—of the gravity of the case in Ireland; they were warned by the men best qualified to warn them. They did not deny that there was a case for legislation; they said the judicial rents were sacred and could not be

*Mr. Sexton*

House use its power to relieve those persons to the detriment of the law-abiding tenants of Ireland? If this House were to divide, not upon the question of the poetic justice which hon. Members opposite desire to mete out to landlords, but on the comparative merits of the tenants of Ulster and the tenants which the hon. Members have misguided, there would be very little doubt about the vote the House would give this afternoon.

(4.52.) MR. J. REDMOND (Waterford): Sir, the speech to which we have just listened might have been made by any hon. Gentleman who had not heard one single word of the Debate upon this Bill. The speech of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh might have been made at any time during the last few years. Every word said was equally true before Clause 13 was passed last year. What is our position? The Government, at the instance of the hon. Members for South Tyrone and West Belfast, Mr. Parnell and others, passed into law a clause which recognised that there was a state of things existing in Ireland with reference to evicted tenants which demanded legislation. The present First Lord of the Treasury put that clause in his Land Bill believing that the grievance existed, and that the clause would bring peace to Ireland. The clause has failed from the inherent defects which we have pointed out; and in this Bill we propose to apply the principles of the Redemption of Rent Act of last year. Sir, that is not an original suggestion. It is a suggestion that was made as long ago as the 5th June, 1891, by the late Mr. Parnell. He put down a specific clause against the Bill of last year, but the clause was, for some reason or other, ruled out of order. A question was addressed by the late Mr. Parnell to the present Leader of the House as to whether it would not be possible to include in the Bill dealing with long leaseholders a clause for the restoration of evicted tenants; and on the 4th June last year the right hon. Gentleman

admitted the importance of such a clause, which he said would assist the landlords, and would be welcomed by the Government. The Member for South Tyrone said to-day that the chief reason why he thought the clause would not be operative was that the Land Commission would not sanction the transaction. He never said anything like that last year. He dealt with an objection which has been found fatal—and it is this, that the landlords will obstruct its working. The hon. Member said—

"The objection is not a practical one, because the landlords would be as anxious to come to terms as the tenants."

But, Sir, this clause has failed, because the hon. Member for South Tyrone was entirely wrong in his estimate of the landlords. The hon. Member said he knew one landlord who had refused to act under Clause 13. I said I knew 300. I spoke by the card; I had their names in my pocket. There was established in Cork an Evicted Tenants' Union, which was independent of any political Party, and in no way connected with the Plan of Campaign estates. It was an organisation called into being for the purpose of endeavouring to get a large number of the tenants evicted in recent years back into their homes. Last September this Association issued a circular to all the landlords in the neighbourhood from whose estates tenants had been evicted. The circular was sent out broadcast to all the landlords who had evicted their tenants in the neighbourhood; but out of the whole number there was only one case in which a settlement was brought about, every other case having been obstructed by the refusal of the landlord either to take notice of the circular at all, or to enter into negotiations. I submit that this establishes the point I have risen to make—namely, that this clause has failed owing to the fact that the landlords obstructed the working of Clause 13 of the Act of last year. It has expired, and the first clause of our Bill proposes that the time for its operation should be extended. The hon. Member for Tyrone is in favour of extending the time; but

suaed the House to discriminate between tenants evicted under the Plan of Campaign as against tenants who have fulfilled their lawful obligations. The Plan of Campaign tenants may be taken as of one type, the Ulster tenants as another; and whilst the tenants of Ulster anxiously wished for compulsory powers of land purchase—which for weighty reasons of State this House refused—it is seriously proposed by the hon. Gentleman that we should give to the Plan of Campaign tenants that advantage that we refused to others. Not only that; not only would the hon. Member give these tenants the right of compulsory purchase, but he would give it to them because of their own mis-doings. Sir, of all the ways of promoting social order, I consider the last we should adopt would be the placing of a premium upon lawlessness and a penalty upon the splendid fulfilment of duty by private citizens. Sir, it is complained that in these Debates we traverse well-worn ground; but we have either to meet ancient arguments or allow the case against us to go by default. The hon. Member for West Belfast, following the hon. Member for East Mayo, stated it as a matter which admitted of no doubt that if Mr. Parnell's Arrears Bill of 1886 had been accepted by this House there would have been no Plan of Campaign. The answer to that has been repeated *ad nauseum*—namely, that Mr. Parnell's Bill would not have affected those tenants who did not pay their rents in 1876. The Bill of 1887 gave them what they had a right to receive. Another point is that Mr. Parnell's Bill only dealt with judicial tenants, and that the tenants affected by the Plan of Campaign were not judicial tenants. On the Ponsonby estate, for example, and it will be universally admitted to be a typical estate—out of 250 tenants the number of judicial tenants was only 27. Therefore, Sir, I say that 90 per cent. of the tenantry would have been excluded from the benefit even under Mr. Parnell's Bill. That being so, I think my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Mid Armagh gave an explanation and mentioned the sufficient cause giving

rise to the Plan of Campaign. The reasons given by hon. Members opposite are altogether inadequate, but if reference be made to the outside speeches made by hon. Members in the past, I venture to think the true origin will be found. My hon. Friend quoted from a speech said to have been made by the Member for Waterford at the Chicago Convention. I have also seen in the *Enniscorthy Guardian* of November, 1886, a speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, and this is what he is reported to have said:—

“ Home Rule was defeated at the last election, and I say, advisedly, in the face of the defeat, that if the Tories had been able to govern Ireland by the ordinary law the cause of Home Rule would be thrown back for a generation.”

When the Home Rule Bill was introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, he rested his case upon the social condition of Ireland, saying that there were only two alternatives—we must either yield to the demands of the Irish Representatives, or go in for a system of coercion such as was never known before. To make that good, the Home Rule Bill not having passed, it was obligatory upon hon. Gentlemen opposite to force upon us a policy of coercion. That was the simple explanation, and not the rejection of the Bill of Mr. Parnell, which could not have affected the object it was intended to serve. Sir, we have all heard of an original mode of warfare—namely, wounding the soldiers on their own side in order to excite the compassion of the enemy. When the compassion of their opponents had been excited, steps were taken to relieve the victims of the Plan of Campaign. On behalf of the victims in Tipperary, appeals were made in the Press. They denounced the Plan of Campaign, and appealed for alms to relieve them. A letter appeared in the *Irish Times* in which a woman named Ellen O'Connor stated that she had applied to Father Humphreys for assistance, and that the reply of Father Humphreys was that he would not degrade the noble warfare against Smith-Barry and landlordism by establishing a system of outdoor relief. If Father Humphreys would not do that, why should this

Mr. George Wyndham

House use its power to relieve those persons to the detriment of the law-abiding tenants of Ireland? If this House were to divide, not upon the question of the poetic justice which hon. Members opposite desire to mete out to landlords, but on the comparative merits of the tenants of Ulster and the tenants which the hon. Members have misguided, there would be very little doubt about the vote the House would give this afternoon.

(4.52.) MR. J. REDMOND (Waterford): Sir, the speech to which we have just listened might have been made by any hon. Gentleman who had not heard one single word of the Debate upon this Bill. The speech of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh might have been made at any time during the last few years. Every word said was equally true before Clause 13 was passed last year. What is our position? The Government, at the instance of the hon. Members for South Tyrone and West Belfast, Mr. Parnell and others, passed into law a clause which recognised that there was a state of things existing in Ireland with reference to evicted tenants which demanded legislation. The present First Lord of the Treasury put that clause in his Land Bill believing that the grievance existed, and that the clause would bring peace to Ireland. The clause has failed from the inherent defects which we have pointed out; and in this Bill we propose to apply the principles of the Redemption of Rent Act of last year. Sir, that is not an original suggestion. It is a suggestion that was made as long ago as the 5th June, 1891, by the late Mr. Parnell. He put down a specific clause against the Bill of last year, but the clause was, for some reason or other, ruled out of order. A question was addressed by the late Mr. Parnell to the present Leader of the House as to whether it would not be possible to include in the Bill dealing with long leaseholders a clause for the restoration of evicted tenants; and on the 4th June last year the right hon. Gentleman

admitted the importance of such a clause, which he said would assist the landlords, and would be welcomed by the Government. The Member for South Tyrone said to-day that the chief reason why he thought the clause would not be operative was that the Land Commission would not sanction the transaction. He never said anything like that last year. He dealt with an objection which has been found fatal—and it is this, that the landlords will obstruct its working. The hon. Member said—

“The objection is not a practical one, because the landlords would be as anxious to come to terms as the tenants.”

But, Sir, this clause has failed, because the hon. Member for South Tyrone was entirely wrong in his estimate of the landlords. The hon. Member said he knew one landlord who had refused to act under Clause 13. I said I knew 300. I spoke by the card; I had their names in my pocket. There was established in Cork an Evicted Tenants' Union, which was independent of any political Party, and in no way connected with the Plan of Campaign estates. It was an organisation called into being for the purpose of endeavouring to get a large number of the tenants evicted in recent years back into their homes. Last September this Association issued a circular to all the landlords in the neighbourhood from whose estates tenants had been evicted. The circular was sent out broadcast to all the landlords who had evicted their tenants in the neighbourhood; but out of the whole number there was only one case in which a settlement was brought about, every other case having been obstructed by the refusal of the landlord either to take notice of the circular at all, or to enter into negotiations. I submit that this establishes the point I have risen to make—namely, that this clause has failed owing to the fact that the landlords obstructed the working of Clause 13 of the Act of last year. It has expired, and the first clause of our Bill proposes that the time for its operation should be extended. The hon. Member for Tyrone is in favour of extending the time; but



let him and those who think with him be logical, and if they think it is a good clause, let them agree to amend it so as to make it workable. The only Amendment which can do so is one which will apply compulsion in those cases where the landlords stand on their strict rights, and refuse to make terms with their tenants. Here is a clear and definite point at issue. You passed that clause, admitting it to be important; it has been inoperative, and we ask you to remove the defect which has been discovered in it, and enact it in such a form that it will work. If you do so, we may hope in the near future that in Ireland peace will be re-established on those estates, and the result will be to smooth the path of Government in Ireland, and hasten the arrival of the day when we may see the tenantry of Ireland contented and peaceful in their homes.

**\*(5.6.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University):** I had hoped this Debate would not have closed without some expression of opinion, from some occupant of the front Opposition Bench, on the measure now before this House.

**MR. JOHN MORLEY:** The right hon. Member for Bradford has spoken.

**\*MR. MADDEN:** I am aware of that, but what I complain of is that the right hon. Member for Bradford, when he spoke, gave the House no expression of opinion upon the merits of the Bill.

**MR. SHAW LEFEVRE:** I spoke on the Second Reading of the Bill, and I said matters of detail could be dealt with afterwards.

**\*MR. MADDEN:** That is precisely the point of my complaint. The right hon. Gentleman said he would vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, because the only principle it established was, at all events, that some new step should be taken to settle this question. Is the right hon. Member aware of the principles contained in this Bill, and which would be affirmed by voting for its Second Reading? It establishes, in the first place, the principle of compulsory sale in favour of one class of tenants

only. I admit that the question of compulsory sale may fairly be discussed on its merits with reference to the tenantry of Ireland as a whole; but when it is brought forward, let this be done with an appreciation of its full consequences, and with some practical suggestion as to the source from which the necessary money is to come. But the objections to the Bill are far greater and deeper than that. It not only establishes compulsory sale, but its essence is that that principle should only be called into operation in aid of evicted tenants. The 4th clause of the Bill is one of the most remarkable ever submitted to the consideration of any Legislative Assembly. It provides that after the lapse of any number of years, even if the evicted tenant is dead, he or his representative may come to the Court and simply say—"I, or the man I represent, was evicted, and therefore I have a right to the land, and ask to be put in possession of it." The Bill draws no distinction between just and unjust evictions, and the mere fact of eviction is a test of the man's right to repossession. And that is not all. The landlord may have let the land, and the occupying tenant may have been for years in possession of it; yet there is no recognition of his right, and he is to be hustled out of possession, and if he does not go he is to be sent to gaol. In the 4th clause, what is called a vesting order is to be made in favour of the evicted tenant, and that may be put in force by attachment against anybody. When the hon. Member for Tyrone pointed out that this would apply even if the substituted tenant had purchased his holding under the Land Purchase Act, hon. Members opposite seemed to be somewhat startled by it, and they said, "Oh, no! If the new tenant has bought he will not be disturbed." In this they were mistaken. The Member for the North Division of Dublin said that the clause might be incorrectly framed, but for the purpose of its framers it could not have been better drawn. But what I cannot understand is why hon. Members opposite should admit the injustice of disturbing the new tenant who has

*Mr. J. Redmond*

bought under the Purchase Acts, while there is no hardship in turning adrift the tenant who has not purchased, although he may have been for years in occupation, and may have invested his capital in the improvement of his holding. This is a short outline of the Bill, and I do not wonder that on the opposite side the discussion should have wandered somewhat far from its provisions. At the same time, I think the evicted tenants in Ireland will derive but *old comfort* from a study of this Debate, and from the attitude of the Front Opposition Bench. The right hon. Member for Bradford tells us that he votes for the Second Reading simply because he thinks some new steps should be taken. The hon. Member for Waterford speaks of this proposal as if it were a sort of continuation and practical application of the policy of the Government, as embodied in the Land Purchase Bill of last year, and he referred to a statement of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary, that it is desirable, by a legitimate arrangement between parties, that these disputes should be brought to an end. Everybody must re-echo that sentiment, and that is the underlying principle of the 13th clause of the Act of last year. It does no injustice to any person, and does not touch any tenant occupying a holding. But this measure is founded in injustice, both to landlords and outgoing tenants, while it proposes a partial law in favour of the class of tenants in Ireland which least deserves the consideration of the House.

(5.20.) **SIR G. TREVELYAN** (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for leaving me time, before the Division, to answer his questions. From this Bench we support this Bill for the reasons that we gave last Session for supporting, first, the 13th clause of the Purchase Bill, and afterwards the Amendments that were moved to that clause by Gentlemen below the Gangway. This Bill embodies those Amendments, and the gist of it is the 3rd clause. The hon. Member for Dover and the hon. Member for South Tyrone tell us that we put the bad tenants, who have not paid their rents and who have

broken the law, in an advantageous position as compared to the tenants who have obeyed the law, by giving them compulsory purchase. As I read the Bill you do no such thing. What the clause does is not to give compulsory purchase without an alternative, and that alternative is that if the landlord is not willing to make use of the 13th section of the Purchase Act, then the tenants who suffer by his unwillingness shall be put, not in a better position than other tenants, but in the same position of being allowed to be farmers under a fair rent. We say that this is the only method by which you can settle the Irish difficulty. To-day we have gone back from the point of conciliation to which the House had, as a whole, advanced. In the Debates on the 13th clause of the Act of last year, the Government and the whole House adopted a conciliatory and pacific tone, and ceased to talk of the rights and wrongs of the Plan of Campaign, and only talked of how the miseries which resulted from that Plan, as fought on both sides, should be healed. But that has not been the tone of some Gentlemen who have spoken in this Debate; but it is still the intention of hon. Gentlemen who sit beside me on this Bench. We wish to heal these wounds of Ireland, and we believe that this Bill will do so. I have defended the 3rd clause, which merely makes compulsory, under the penalty of having to give a fair rent, that power which was voluntary in the Purchase Bill. The Attorney General for Ireland sees something wonderful in it; but is it not the case, Session after Session, when we find that the voluntary principle will not work, that we make it compulsory? As to the denunciation of the 4th clause by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, you would think that nothing had passed in this House before on the question of the "planter" tenants. But last year we asked the Government to allow these tenants to be bought out under the Irish Church Fund, and on this Bench we are still anxious that means should be adopted for buying them out. We do not wish anything to be done which is harsh or unjust towards them; but we ask

that these five or six thousand evicted tenants, instead of being punished to the end of time—and recollect that they have already been transported from their homes for three or four years, which would be a legal punishment almost sufficient for any fault they might have committed, whatever it was—shall have hope given them of being restored to their homes, and of becoming again peaceable and contented citizens. We say that the Purchase Act has not fulfilled one of its main objects, that of pacifying Ireland; but that this Bill, amended as it will be if it passes the Second Reading, will do justice to the landlord and justice to the planter tenants, and give some hope of mercy and salvation to these five or six thousand evicted men, without mercy and kindness to whom you will never pacify Ireland.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 174; Noes 229.—(Div. List, No. 15.)

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Bill put off for six months.

#### POOR LAW (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 199.)

##### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I have not had the opportunity of consulting the Irish Local Government Board upon this Bill. I understand the Bill does contain some useful provisions, and I do not now object to the Second Reading; but I wish to guard myself against the supposition that I assent to all the proposals in the Bill, as to which I wish to consult with the Local Government Board in Ireland.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday.

*Sir G. Trevelyan*

#### MOTIONS.

##### TOWNS IMPROVEMENT (IRELAND).

On Motion of Mr. Knox, Bill to provide for the improvement of towns in Ireland to be brought in by Mr. Knox, Sir Esmonde, and Mr. Webb.

Bill presented, and read first time.

##### ARCHITECTS' REGISTRATION

On Motion of Mr. Atherley-Jones provide for the registration of architects to be brought in by Mr. Jones, Mr. Justin McCarthy, and Mr. V. Morgan.

Bill presented, and read first time.

##### EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Atherley-Jones provide for the amendment of the law to Employers' Liability, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Jennings.

Bill presented, and read first time.

##### PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE

First Report brought up, and ordered to lie upon the Table, and printed.

##### TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented,—of Report of Subjects of General and Commercial Interest, No. 223 (Bulgaria) [transmitted]; to lie upon the Table.

##### SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1891.

Copy presented,—of Treasury Report dated 26th February, 1892, dated that William Lancaster, Esq. of Gorey, was appointed without Service Certificate, through influence on the part of the Head Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

##### GLEBE LANDS (SALES)

Return presented,—relative to the sale of Glebe Lands (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 121, of Session 1890) [ordered 18th February; Mr. Lefevre]; to lie upon the Table.

House adjourned at ten  
before 8½

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 3rd March, 1892.*

## CLERGY DISCIPLINE (IMMORALITY)

BILL.—[H.L.]

## SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

\*THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I feel myself to be in a rather unusual position in moving a Bill which has been, to my great satisfaction and thankfulness, included and mentioned in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech; but my only desire is that this Bill should be passed, and therefore I am ready to take any part which I possibly can towards that end. I only wish that it had the benefit of one advocacy. Archbishop Magee, whose position here for so many years was so high, whose eloquence, wit, and common sense so recommended any measure which he advocated, and who commanded such influence everywhere outside this House, among the laity of the country as well as among the clergy, was not among the actual framers of this Bill, but he was a very enthusiastic advocate of it; his last great speech was devoted to explaining to the Bishops and clergy of his province the provisions of this Bill and to advocating them. My Lords, it is the same Bill as he then advocated, except in one point to which I shall call attention. Although it is much reduced in bulk, it is only compressed, and compressed in a very simple manner; the wording here and there has been abbreviated; but the large clauses, which, for the sake of fullness, were printed in the Bill as it came before your Lordships on the last occasion, taken out of previous Acts of Parliament, have been placed together in a Schedule at the end. My Lords, the one point which is added to the Bill I shall dwell on at length, and I will say, in the first instance, that it was not advocated but disliked by Archbishop Magee. He objected to it on the ground that it made too little of the office of a Bishop. Another high authority objects to it

on the ground that it makes too much of the office of a Bishop. It is not for me to decide which of the authorities is the higher; but to me it causes a certain amount of satisfaction that the objections mutually destroy each other; and I do not think there is much fault to be found with the provision, as a just mean between the two. Indeed, my Lords, though Archbishop Magee's advocacy would have been so powerful and so impressive, I cannot believe that this Bill really needs any advocacy. It has been prepared through some years by a Committee on which were good enough to sit some of the strongest, wisest, and most experienced Members of this House, both in the Church and the State. It passed through the Standing Committee, where it received a careful examination; it passed your Lordships' House; and Mr. Smith, that wise and sound statesman, whom we lost so immediately after the Archbishop, had undertaken to pass it through the House of Commons; and, indeed, it only perished on one of the very last days of the Session with other victims, and unexpectedly. I would remind your Lordships that this Bill deals with morals only; that it has no relation to doctrine or to ritual; it is simply confined to cases of clerical immorality. The necessity of such a Bill lies in small compass. If a layman of influence in a parish is a licentious man, his influence of course is extremely mischievous; his example is followed by the young and foolish over whom he has influence—he discredits his position. But, if the offender is the one man in the place who is commissioned, and supported by law, to be the guide and the teacher and the comforter of the young, the sick, the dying and the poor; if he is the counsellor of many; if he is placed there to be the expounder of Divine Revelation and the minister of Holy Sacraments and there is no other man who can be recognised by the Church there; then how fares it with the people if he is drunken, if he is profligate or a seducer? We know the visible signs—there is the empty Church; but there are worse invisible signs,—the lack of his influence in regions which are not before the public eye is almost more terrible than the

emptiness of the Church in which men ought to be worshipping God and learning His ways; the sick are unwilling to send for him; the parsonage house, which ought to be the centre of so much that is good, is suspected, is shunned, is pointed at; the man himself is conscious that he has no message to deliver but what would reproach his own actions: that he has no mission because he is the parishioner who most of all needs to be reclaimed. But, my Lords, the law, which surrounds the good pastor and keeps him in his place, and so supports him and confers on the country such vast benefits by that support,—this law virtually offers no means by which a traitor can be got rid of. And the reason why it offers no means is a singular reason. It is a long sad history. It begins in an old wrong theory. It began in the theory that the man, as priest, was an essential intermediary between God and man; that good morals were a most desirable and necessary addition but not essential to his office among his people. Consequently the first processes instituted, in order to put an end if possible to scandals, were instituted upon what we cannot but in this day call a most wrong basis. Processes instituted against such a man were held to be *pro salute animæ*; it was not the parish or the people that were in view; it was the improvement of the priest that was intended. And when legislation started from so wrong and so mistaken a base, then there came in a steady constant accumulation of precedents of leniency, and even favour, which have landed us in this position: namely, that really and truly there is no means certainly available of getting rid of an evil pastor. Consequently, you have certain scandals not arising frequently, but from time to time, and echoed all round the sky until it seems as if the air was full of them. Such a case as that which occurred in a diocese a little north of this, last year or the year before, when a man, guilty of repeated acts of drunkenness, has at last evidence produced against him, is brought into the Arches Court and receives a sentence of three months' suspension. At the end of three months he comes back, and the first sermon that he preaches is a lively

*The Archbishop of Canterbury*

description of the holiday that he has enjoyed abroad. And there is the case well known to your Lordships and to all England, that infamous case which cost two successive Bishops of Exeter £14,000 and £1,400 respectively. Now, my Lords, so much has been said on this subject before that I will not amplify this part of the matter, but will call your Lordships' attention at once to the change that has been made in the Bill. In the last Bill the conviction of certain crimes and misdemeanours enumerated in Clause 1, as well as conviction of treason or felony, vacated the living *ipso facto*. The law before was that cases of treason and felony brought home should vacate the living *ipso facto*, and there were added to these certain new offences which should *ipso facto* vacate a living. Well, my Lords, we have found that very wide objections indeed have been entertained to these additions to the *ipso facto* principle of vacating among people of all sorts of opinions. There is this to be said obviously at once: that it is a strange thing that a property, and still more a spiritual function, should be vacated by the sentence of a Magistrate who has no relation whatever to a benefice, and who in his sentence can take no notice at all of the effect which it will have in the deprivation of the benefice. It is not well that there should be no notice taken of the sentence; it is well that it should be made known as widely as possible. A clergyman, we must remember, is necessarily in his position as a beneficed man in two capacities. He is the holder of property by the authority of the law, and he has a spiritual work and duty—what is called the cure of souls of the parishioners—committed to him by his Bishop. Now when the patron has presented a man to a benefice, so that the property will come to him, the Bishop is then required by law to institute him to the spiritual care of the benefice, upon the presentation of the patron; and it does seem reasonable that he should also be similarly required to declare that the living is vacated, before he proceeds to institute another man into the same place. It is different, of course, in the case of death; there is no necessity for a declaration upon that occasion—the

fact is notorious that the late rector is dead. Well, then, Clause 1 enumerates two kinds of gross offences. It first of all mentions those which already *ipso facto* vacate the living, and then the other class which at present do not *ipso facto* vacate the living, but ought to be made to do so. We have in this Bill made no change whatever as to the first class. Treason and felony will still, according to this Bill, vacate a living exactly in the same manner as they do now, and the benefice can be immediately re-filled. We do not repeal the Treason and Felony Act, or any clause or any word of it. But the Bill does lay upon the Bishop the further duty then of declaring that it is vacant, before he proceeds to institute another man. The declaration of the Bishop in this case has nothing whatever to do with vacating the living—it is vacant, and, if it is so wished, a man can be instituted to it; but the Bishop is to be called upon to declare it vacant before he proceeds to put another man into the place. And the man by this Bill is also rendered incapable of receiving further preferment, which seems the most just of measures, until he is either pardoned by the Crown, or until he is otherwise declared once more capable of receiving preferment. That is the first class of offences. The second class of misdemeanours is recited in the first clause, and I will venture to say that the world at large, reasonable sensible people being judges—nay, vicious men themselves being judges, there can be no doubt that everyone would agree that the man who commits such offences is disqualified from being the pastor of a flock, disqualified from exercising this cure of souls, and there ought to be no difficulty in removing him from that pastorate and that cure. But, my Lords, as the law stands now the offence may be proved, the man may be convicted, the man may be sentenced, and yet he is safe in this position to all intents and purposes; he has to be again tried from beginning to end before he can be displaced; and he has to be tried by processes which are expensive and complicated, technical and uncertain, in the very highest degree; he can appeal, and appeal again, until the expense, protract-

tion, and uncertainty of the suits into which he may bring the authority who tries to do his duty by him and the Church, may absolutely win the day. Now the effect of this Bill then is to make civil conviction for these offences conclusive as to the fact of their having been committed; and the Bill then provides that the Ecclesiastical Authorities should accept the verdict as a fact, and that they should declare the vacancy of the living. Now this, my Lords, is the point upon which there is difference of opinion; but, as I said, the difference of opinion is this: it is not simply one difference of opinion with the Bill, but on one side it is thought that the office of the Bishop is made too little of, by requiring him simply to declare that the living is vacant when vacated in this manner; and, on the other hand, it is thought that it is making too much of the office of the Bishop by bringing him in at all. I do not really think that, those being the two poles of difference, your Lordships will differ from the Bill. I believe your Lordships will consider that the Bishop is in his proper place and too much by no means made of his office. If once this Bill passes into law, the first effect of it will be that there will be no longer this wearisome and most uncertain process to go through. Those are the two classes of offences proposed to be dealt with: those which already vacate livings, and those which ought to vacate livings; and this the simple step which is to be taken. At present, my Lords, it is the authorities who attempt to do their duty who are punished and not the offender—the offender is pretty secure. What with time, with expensiveness, with technicality, men are, as well as have been, secure in their place. There they stay, safe, to old age; and in that old age the hoary head is not only a crown of shame to that man, but it is a crown of shame to that Church which cannot help keeping him in his place. I repeat once more, what I have said emphatically in this place before, my Lords, that these cases are very few. I doubt if you could find anywhere a body of 26,000 men among whom there are so few offenders of this kind—I think that is quite certain. The cases are few, but there ought to

be none. The cases are few, but every single case counteracts. I do not know what amount of labour of excellent, virtuous, and devoted pastors. And, my Lords, how unfair such administration and how unfair such a state of things upon a great profession which we ought to render attractive! What would be said, my Lords, if in any other profession—if in the Army or the Navy, superior officers had not only to defray the cost of every inquiry, but to find themselves baffled and defeated by technicalities at the close? What would be said if the Judges (many Judges are noble Lords in this House at the present moment) what would be said by all the world if the Judges had to bear all the costs of both sides whenever an attempt was made to remove a criminal from office? The rest of the Bill, my Lords, after the 1st clause is occupied simply by procedure; no principles are changed, but it is a simplification of the procedure for the trial of a man accused of moral offences who has not been in the Civil Court. The case of a man who has been in a Civil Court is already disposed of; but then there are other cases where a man has not been in the Civil Court. The improvements or simplification of procedure are these: The Diocesan Court remains, and the improvements are in three obvious points. First, the Diocesan Court is strengthened by five Assessors who are to act as a kind of jury on matters of fact—not a jury, which might make difficulties in the way of appeal—five Assessors; the Chancellor, the head of the Court, is a layman; two of his Assessors are to be Judges or Justices of the Peace, holders of judicial appointments, laymen; and three are to be clergymen. They are to decide upon matters of fact only; not to deal with matters of law. That is the first improvement. The second improvement is that there should be only one appeal; these are not cases which need more than one appeal, if any; but it is desirable, as error is always possible, that the man should have power to appeal, and, with the proper permission, one appeal is allowed, but only one. At present, as I have said, the number of appeals is one of the worst causes of

*The Archbishop of Canterbury*

the defeat of justice. The third improvement introduced is this—and your Lordships will agree with me I am sure that it is the greatest possible improvement. I have pointed out how fatal the old precedents of punishment are and in what evil condition they have landed us, and the 5th clause of the Bill provides that henceforth the decisions are to be made in the interests of the place and people, and not to rest upon precedents of punishment. In the process of abbreviation the words “rather than on the precedents of punishment” have been dropped out, simply for the purposes of abbreviation; and I shall ask your Lordships’ leave to introduce them again by way of amendment. But that is what the clause means as it stands—that regard is to be had to the interests of the people. There is another point to which I desire to call your Lordships’ attention. In order that it might be thoroughly intelligible to all, even the most obviously essential steps of the processes were described in separate clauses in the Bill as it was before your Lordships’ House last year; but, by very wise instructions, as it seems to me, from Her Majesty’s Government, such steps as those are to be committed to the Rule Committee. All these steps that have been placed under the ordering of the Rule Committee are so placed for reasons which have commended themselves to the Legal Advisers of the Government; but I need scarcely say that, if there are any such steps which it is thought, in the wisdom of this House, should be replaced as clauses in the Bill, that can easily be done in Committee, and we shall be only very thankful for suggestions of that kind. I would remind your Lordships that when the rules are made they have to lie 40 days on the Table of both Houses, and that any Rule is capable of being annulled by an Address to Her Majesty praying that it should be so annulled. Well, my Lords, the Bill seems then, in the light in which I am able to view it,—its necessity and its provisions—so just, so reasonable, to answer so necessary an end by such simple means, that one asks oneself who are the opponents of the Bill. My Lords, there are enemies and enemies. I shall

speaking with the utmost moderation, I hope, of any opposition to the Bill; but there are honourable adversaries of the Church, very decided adversaries but fair and honourable men, who, in the other House, and in other places, have declared emphatically that the Bill ought to pass. If there are any others who have different motives; if there are any who would keep abuses in the Church to forward their own views of what ought to be done with the Church; what a serious position they stand in! They cry out one moment "Souls are perishing because of neglect"; and the next moment they cry out "Let them perish until we can carry destructive measures of our own." If there be any such opponents, we can but trust that they will pause. At any rate, the very existence of such a reason puts an end to the influence that any other reasons which they might allege could produce. And I trust that no professed Churchmen will swell their number on grounds which are not much more than matters of etiquette. I do not then believe, my Lords, that any Legislature would withhold legislation upon such a subject for such a purpose, —still less these two great Houses: legislation recommended, as this is, by some of our very wisest both in Church and State: simple legislation I must call it, for the removal of vicious men from positions which have been created for one purpose and one purpose only: to be the very strongholds and vantage grounds of virtue.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>."  
—(*The Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

\***LORD GRIMTHORPE:** My Lords, I certainly am not one of the enemies of the Bill, though it is not the Bill which your Lordships passed last year, and I cannot say that I am at all convinced by the reasons given by the most rev. Prelate for altering that Bill, by the Government, and not by the Bishops. Perhaps your Lordships will allow me to remind you of the course that these Clergy Discipline Bills have taken during the last four years. This Bill, in a very important respect which I shall mention presently, is put back very much to the condition of the Bill of 1888; of which it is not too much to say that the late Arch-

bishop of York, I mean Archbishop Thomson, destroyed it by his speech on Third Reading. Complaint was made of his not intervening earlier. He answered that complaint by saying that he had not intervened for the very good reason that he had not received the altered copy of the Bill at York until the very day when it was to be discussed here. Everybody felt, I think, that his speech on Third Reading, although neither he nor I divided the House against it, was fatal to the Bill. What happened next after that is not altogether immaterial. The most rev. Prelate has rightly mentioned Archbishop Magee as having taken an active part in this matter from the beginning. In the course of the winter of 1888, he and a Member of the Government, knowing I had begun the opposition to the Bill of 1888, asked me to draw a fresh one. I said, "It is no use my drawing a fresh Bill if you are going to insist upon its being upon what is commonly called the lines of the late Bill, if it is to contain what I and other people call clerical aggression." I was assured by both of them, and by the most rev. Prelate who has now spoken, afterwards, that they had no such wish or intention, and that, if the Bill of 1888 did do what I said, it was not by their desire. Of course I was satisfied with that, and I did draw another Bill. I took counsel with two most competent persons, namely, the gentleman who then sealed with seven seals (I mean Mr. Justice Jeune, who was Chancellor of seven dioceses) and with Archbishop Magee himself; we spent a considerable time in settling that Bill; and without repeating the compliments the most rev. Prelate has paid to Archbishop Magee, I will pay another: I was greatly struck not merely with his acuteness (because everybody knew that) but with his readiness to apprehend legal principles, and being able to discuss a Bill with two lawyers on quite equal terms. It was too late, I suppose, in the winter to proceed with it in the following year; at any rate it was not proceeded with; but I know this: Archbishop Thomson expressed the opinion that the Bill of 1888, or anything like it, would not do, and that something like the Bill which



had been settled by the three persons I have mentioned was the basis to go upon. Early in the following year, as the most rev. Prelate told your Lordships last year, he convened a sort of Lambeth Congress, or Conference, or Conclave (or whatever is the proper term) consisting of the two Archbishops, the Bishop of London, my noble and learned Friend opposite, Lord Selborne, another of my noble and learned Friends, Lord Herschell, Lord Thring, Lord Cross, who had taken an active part in 1888, Mr. Justice Jeune, and myself. And this singular thing happened: although several of those persons had taken very different views in 1888, when we came to discuss the Bill in 1890 there was absolutely no division, except upon one comparatively trifling point, as the most rev. Prelate mentioned last year, and the one dissentient, Archbishop Thomson, did not think it worth while to express any further opinion about it; and, what is more, Archbishop Magee, who had succeeded him before the Bill came into Parliament in the following year, was perfectly satisfied with the Bill as it had been drawn, and vindicated it in the way the most rev. Prelate has mentioned, and indeed more strongly than he has stated, on what I and others think the most important deviation now. My Lords, the most rev. Prelate has said that he will move an Amendment to restore certain words in the section which we all thought of great value at Lambeth. I am very glad that he will, and I need not say more about it. The other point, about procedure, is a more serious thing than the most rev. Prelate seems to take it to be. To put it shortly, I may say that the Bill of this year gives very much larger powers to what is called the Rule Committee than the Bill of last year did. It enables the Rule Committee, which is to consist of the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, the Dean of Arches, and the three Privy Councillor Bishops, to make any rules they please relating to "procedure"—a very large word which was not in the Bill of last year. Then come some other points in that clause which I need not dwell upon, as they are not very material, except that it

includes, quite unnecessarily, the appointment of a Deputy Chancellor, which was provided for completely by a very simple clause last year. Then comes a thing which I know is thought of much consequence by more learned people than I am, and that is that the Rule Committee may make rules "concerning the enforcing of sentences, whether by civil or ecclesiastical officers." It seems to me perfectly clear that under those terms together, "procedure" and "enforcing of sentences," any kind of jurisdiction may be invented. No doubt it is a good thing to save both Houses of Parliament the trouble of discussing details which are of no public consequence or interest, and which can be quite well done by a small Committee; but, surely, such matters as procedure, and enforcing of sentences by certain officers, which were the great questions in 1888, do seem a great deal too large to leave to a mere general clause, protected by nothing but the subsection which follows, that the rules are to be laid on the Table of the Houses of Parliament, and take their chance of somebody being able to get a night in this House or the other to discuss them if he has any objection to them. Moreover, the result will be that nobody can learn from the Act what it really enacts, or what influences are being used to get particular things enacted by that Secret Committee. My Lords, I am told that, tempting as it is to remove from discussion in both Houses of Parliament details which some people may think immaterial, there is another view of it—that certain people resent very much that mode of withdrawing things from their discussion and decision which they think of great consequence; and I cannot help thinking that, in avoiding Charybdis, the Government (who, I suppose, are the promoters of this Bill) have run into a Scylla which may perhaps bring them to ruin if other things do not. That is all I have to remark upon the minor details of the Bill; I mention them first merely to get them out of the way. Now, my Lords, I come to that which the most rev. Prelate rightly treated as a material alteration, and there I must first dissent

*Lord Grimthorpe*

from the view that he takes of the 1st clause. He said—and no doubt he intended that it should be so—that the present law was left alone, and that—

"If a clergyman is convicted of treason or felony—"

I stop there—his conviction *ipso facto* deprives him. But, I think, if the most rev. Prelate will read carefully a little lower down, he will see that it is not so. I will read it to your Lordships, leaving out the immaterial things—

"If a clergyman is convicted of treason or felony . . . then, after the date at which the conviction, order, or finding becomes conclusive, the preferment (if any) held by him shall without further trial be"—

what? "Shall be vacant"? Nothing of the kind—

"shall be declared by the Bishop to be vacant."

That is a total alteration of the law of England. Whether it is the intention of anyone I cannot tell, but if it is, it is, at any rate, very badly expressed, and certainly will in future years be demanded to involve an alteration of a great deal of the existing law. Because I can tell your Lordships, to put it shortly, that there have been at different times since the Reformation more than a dozen enactments (I do not say Acts of Parliament, because one or two of them comprise several distinct enactments), all of which, as Archbishop Magee pointed out to his Convocation—and I am surprised that the most rev. Prelate has not paid more attention to that speech—*ipso facto* do vacate livings for all kinds of things—some of them doctrinal things; and, surely, if a doctrinal or ritualistic error may vacate a living *ipso facto*, immorality ought to do so. I will just run through them as shortly as possible. First, the earliest Reformation Acts of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth expressly "restored" all spiritual jurisdiction to the Crown. All the four Acts of Uniformity enabled clergymen to be deprived, without the intervention of the Bishop, either by a Judge at Assizes, or by the Chancellor of the diocese; and it is expressly stated in the Act of Elizabeth that the law to be observed is not the

canon law, which I shall have to mention presently, but "the Queen's ecclesiastical law"—a well-known old phrase used by the greatest lawyers of all times since the Reformation. Then comes perhaps one still more remarkable—what is called the Great Heresy Act of the 13th of Elizabeth, which expressly leaves to the Ordinary, who is the Chancellor of the diocese generally, the power to deprive, which he always had and always exercised. Besides that, the same Act, without any relation to heresy, *ipso facto* vacates a living if the clergyman does not read himself in in proper time,—that is, publicly declare his assent to the Prayer Book and the Articles. No Bishop intervenes there; no Court intervenes; simply if he does not do it in the proper time anybody may take note (it has been so decided) and the living is *ipso facto* vacant. All that will soon be demanded to be repealed if this Bill passes. Then there is the very important Act of 1870, which the first clause of this extends in the confused way I noticed just now. As the most rev. Prelate mentioned last year, the old law before 1870 was that treason and felony *ipso facto* forfeited a living. The word "forfeiture" was used, not "vacation;" but the result is exactly the same. Then to come to later things, take the 1st and 2nd of Victoria c. 106—a very long Act which provides for many different things. If a clergyman engages in trade or takes a farm above 100 acres he may be prosecuted in the Chancellor's Court by the Bishop—the Bishop being not the judge, but the prosecutor; and the Chancellor is to suspend him first and deprive him afterwards. I know very well that the word "Chancellor" is not put before "deprive" in the latter case; but that cannot matter the least, because, as I say, the Bishop is the prosecutor and not the judge. The same Act deals with pluralities. If a clergyman happens to have two livings or benefices of any kind, and takes another without declaring which of the former ones he vacates, he *ipso facto* vacates both. If he is instituted to a living without any right to hold two, the institution *ipso facto* vacates the former. Non-residence after a certain time, after two years' seques-

tration, under the same Act *ipso facto* vacates the living. Surely that is a thing in which you might expect to find the Bishop having this jurisdiction, if anywhere. But no, the law has not entrusted it to him: this modern theory had not been invented then, or in fact until four years ago. Then comes the Act with which it is now the fashion I see with all parties to find fault—the Clergy Discipline Act of 1840. That was Bishop Philpott's Act; he imposed it upon the Bishops and upon Parliament after having been thoroughly beaten in the previous Session. The only precedent for Episcopal Judges was the Court of High Commission, which your Lordships know was twice abolished by Parliament. Under a clause in that Act of 1840 the Bishop may indeed sit and try, but he cannot declare without trying; and that clause was described in the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts as being thoroughly obsolete; it was found, for reasons which I need not go into, unworkable or unsuitable; and it was said, I do not know with what correctness, by some of the witnesses before that Commission, that it has only been acted on twice; except of course by consent, for anybody may consent to the Bishop trying, depriving, or anything else. Then comes in the order of date the Act of 1870, which Archbishop Magee naturally dwelt on much in his speech to his Convocation. And, my Lords, what has been the excuse made by the agitators against this Bill, who, in spite of what the most rev. Prelate has said, are mainly of one party in the Church, for the Act of 1870 being passed without objection or complaint till now? That it was not understood. I have taken the trouble to look at *Hansard* to see what evidence there was that it was not understood; and I find that it was fully and clearly explained on that point by perhaps the clearest explainer of an Act of Parliament that there has ever been. I mean Lord Westbury. Whatever may have been his defects, certainly want of clearness of explanation was not one of them; so that excuse is a mere *ex post facto* invention without the least historical foundation. And the real history is

Lord Grimthorpe

that in all the three and a half centuries since the Reformation began the personal intervention of a Bishop has never once been recognised as necessary for complete deprivation. It is just possible somebody may say that I have forgotten one declaration (I cannot call it an enactment, for it is not one) that the Bishop is to declare sentences of deprivation only in the 122nd Canon of 1603. To which I give this simple answer: that that Canon was illegal: it was first *ultra vires*. Convocation has no power whatever, as great authorities have said, to do anything relating to judicature; and, further than that, it is expressly illegal, because the great Act of Henry VIII., for the "Submission of the Clergy," under which any power was left to Convocation to make Canons, expressly says that if a Canon is contrary in any respect to the law of England, either present or future, it shall be void. It was also historically wrong. It is a doctrine that has been laid down in the Courts that, if a Canon is only declaratory of ancient law, it may stand as a recognition of the Queen's Ecclesiastical Law. That Canon could not be so, because it was contrary to all the previous Acts I have mentioned; and, moreover, a Canon had been made in 1571, saying exactly the contrary, though that code was never ratified by the Queen. Moreover, let me tell your Lordships that a person who is more a layman than a great many Diocesan Chancellors have been, has been held to have a complete right to deprive—I mean the Dean of Arches. So far as I can make out from the books that tell of such things, there has been no clerical Dean of Arches since 1559, but there have been many clerical Chancellors until recently. Then *a fortiori*, if the Dean of Arches has been decided—as he has been by the Privy Council—to have the right to deprive, that Canon, professing to take away the power of the Chancellors to deprive, was invalid and good for nothing. Let me call your Lordships' attention a little more to Archbishop Magee's great speech, as the most rev. Prelate rightly called it, which was mainly directed to this very question of deprivation. It is true, as the most rev. Prelate says, that he

gave both reasons: both that it was making too much of the Bishop, and also too little. But that is not a dilemma, as the most rev. Prelate imagines, but a cumulation. Archbishop Magee said, in substance, "I resent the idea of being ordered to come into Court (and I remember that he used these words) as the executioner or crier of a Court to proclaim a judgment which I may differ from. I shall have read the proceedings in whatever Court has ordered the man to be deprived. The Chancellor, who may have proceeded under the rules of procedure which are to be made, or the Civil Court, may have decreed the deprivation; but I may think that the man ought not to be deprived. Am I to come in, thinking all that, and, as a mere machine, a mere crier of the Court, to declare him deprived when I think he ought not to be? That was Archbishop Magee's argument, not mine, though I had helped him with the legal history; and it seems to me a very good one. But I will carry it a little further. Supposing any Bishop says, on high spiritual grounds, "I do not choose to be ordered by the State to do this and that, which is no part of my regular spiritual duty," he would be doing a thing which would be most popular with the High Church Party, who have got up all this opposition. They are fond of saying, "Oh, we would obey the Bishops if they were free, but they are bound to act under the State law; and we decline to recognise that." It is easy enough to say that no Bishop would dare to retain a convicted clergyman. But he may think it a case for suspension and not deprivation, and then what are you to do? Are we to have Bishops manacled and sent to prison if they will not obey? Everybody knows that will be impracticable. Then there was another point that Archbishop Magee took, which I confess had not occurred to me, though I see no answer to it. He said, "How is deprivation more of an episcopal or spiritual act than suspension? A man can be suspended by the Chancellor for five or ten years, or any time. What is the spiritual difference between that and deprivation?" Nobody in his lower House of Convocation, which voted against

him, could answer that question. The fact is, my Lords, that this demand is only made as a first step towards getting more; and the sort of things that are wanted more we have the means of knowing; because a body of great importance, called the English Church Union, which seems to me to play very much the part of another very important Body at Rome—namely, the Jesuits,—I do not mean to call Church Unionists Jesuits in the popular sense; but it is said that the Jesuits are more powerful than the Pope; and it is quite plain that the English Church Union are more powerful than the Bishops and can frighten them—yes, can frighten them into accepting things which they would never have done voluntarily, and which they never thought of a year ago, or rather which they all agreed against. Just let me tell your Lordships one or two of the things that this important Body, which, by-the-bye, I see boasts of having 25 members of the Episcopate, not all English, I suppose, but still I believe some.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: There is not one.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: I am glad to hear that; I know there was one.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: He went out of it.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: It is a very powerful Body nevertheless. What have they proclaimed to mankind lately? "The power to govern the Church," they say, in a published series of 18 resolutions,

"resides by succession in the Episcopate acting synodically, and in other canonical manner, and in the Episcopate alone."

What is the power that they say belongs to the Bishops and to them alone?

"This power is not limited to doctrine, but embraces positive discipline." "The Church, by its own inherent authority, has power to make laws, to administer laws, and to enforce the observance of its laws in the spiritual domain: in other words, it possesses legislative, executive, and judicial powers."

Then they say—

"The law administered is the Canon Law."

Canon Law is Roman Law, composed of the decrees of Popes, which have been declared over and over again not.

to be the Ecclesiastical Law of England. Then they go on to say—

“Procedure, legislative and judicial, is expressly provided for by the Canon Law ;”

that is to say, not by Parliament, but by the Canon Law, which is nothing at all. Then your Lordships will be interested to know perhaps how much rights you have as the State—

“The State being *jure divino* the guardian of civil rights is by consequence bound, upon complaint made, to ascertain.”

What ?

“Whether justice has been done to an incriminated clerk.”

That is, if the clerk is not satisfied with the decree of the Chancellor, or the Bishop it may be, he may go to the Civil Court ; but if it is the other way the party on the other side may not appeal ; which is flatly contrary to one of the fundamental Acts of the Reformation. Then further they say—

“The Statute Law touching ecclesiastical matters is ‘mere temporal’”

(a piece of bad English that they have copied from some ecclesiastical source)

“and consists only of rules laid down by the State for the conduct of the civil power in dealing with such temporal rights as come in contact with spiritual duties. Any so-called Ecclesiastical Court”

(that is to say, the Diocesan Court which this Bill, like former Acts, purposes to authorise to do certain things)

“constituted by Act of Parliament only, possesses no spiritual jurisdiction, and, consequently, all its proceedings are spiritually null and void.”

Your Lordships will remember that everything the Ecclesiastical Court may do under this Bill will be done under the State ; and therefore it is expressly denounced by this English Church Union. Then there is a paragraph dealing with the particular thing in this Bill that they have been raving at, I may say, ever since your Lordships passed the Bill last year.

“None but a Bishop has power to suspend, deprive, or depose a clerk”—

that is to say, all the laws of England that I have been reading to you are wrong and impudent aggressions on the Spirituality, as they call themselves. Then they say—

“No provision for *ipso facto* voidance of an office or benefice can operate without the declaratory sentence of the Bishop in the Spiritual Court.”

Lord Grimthorpe

That is to say, that all that multitude of enactments that I have read to you are *ultra vires* and good for nothing. And then finally—

“Any scheme for the alteration or regulation of procedure in the matter of discipline must be embodied in Canons enacted by Convocation, and such action of Convocation should precede any Parliamentary action needed to give civil sanction to the Canons.”

Now it is very easy, my Lords, to say that such things as those are only ridiculous, and that everybody laughs at them. What do they care about their being ridiculous if they get their way ? It reminds one of the famous saying in one of Thackeray’s books : “What does it matter being called obtrusive provided only you obtrude ?” That is what these people want. They do not care what they are called, if they can get their own way. But, if anybody is inclined to treat the English Church Union with ridicule—which I quite agree it deserves, while it deserves something more—there is something else that can hardly be ridiculed. I have had a publication sent to me—issued and signed by himself—a declaration by one of the oldest Bishops, a man who has hitherto passed for a man of sense, but who has got frightened ; he has been making a sort of manifesto or declaration to his diocese, from which I must read your Lordships a few words, to show that it is not only the English Church Union that says things of this kind, but some of the Bishops are frightened into adopting them :

“Nor do I hesitate to agree with the principle that Resolutions of Convocation, expressive of approval of a Bill in Parliament on the subject of Church Discipline, cannot give real spiritual authority to such a Bill if it becomes law. If we are to adhere to real Church lines, Canons prescribing the due course of procedure must be enacted by Convocation, and Parliamentary sanction to such Canons subsequently obtained” ;

in other words, he has exactly adopted one of the resolutions that I read to you of the English Church Union. What comes next is worth attending to for another reason ; it shows that all the Bishops, at any rate, do not feel so strongly the immediate necessity for this Bill as the most rev. Prelate does—

“That this will involve delay, and probably some difficulty and friction, must certainly be admitted.”

I read as far as that, and wanted to know how he was going to answer that point. This is the way—

“Still principles are principles”—

with which I thoroughly agree, and it is a principle of the Constitution of England, and has been ever since the Reformation, that neither the Conventions nor any clerical body whatever have any power to meddle with these things. Then he ends by saying—

“I hope then in this matter we shall keep to the old highway.”

My Lords, I venture to ask this question: Is a Bishop justified in telling more ignorant people than himself—I mean his clergy, who naturally take the law from him—that such and such things are principles of the law of England, and that those things are the old highway, when he could not walk three inches along the old highway in company with any lawyer, or law book, without seeing that every word he had been saying was wrong? He might just as well say that he had been into the street and performed a miracle. One statement would be no more true and no less true than the other. Yet this is the way in which, as I said, the English Church Union frightens even Bishops into saying exactly what they want them to say. They know it will be applauded by the dominant party of the clergy, and take their chance of its veracity being questioned. My Lords, I will not trouble you with anything more of that kind, though I could. But the most rev. Prelate, and a great many other people, he says, on both sides in the Church, are impressed with this: that, inasmuch as the institution to a living must be done by the Bishop, it is at any rate logical, though it is not the law of England, that deprivation must be done by the Bishop. But does the most rev. Prelate really think it is the law of England that institution must be done by the Bishop? I do not know whether he has altered the practice in the diocese of Canterbury—I have not looked at it lately;—but I have often read in the papers that the Vicar General of Canterbury had been admitting persons to their benefices; and he is the very person who, in most dioceses, would deprive them if the Bill were carried

as it was passed last year. In Canterbury alone, I think, the Chancellor is not the Vicar General. Your Lordships may think that that is peculiar to Canterbury diocese; but I can show you in five minutes that it is not. First of all I look—and, surely, any Bishop might look—at such common books as Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, or Stephens's; and there they will find that it is part of the duty of the Vicar General to grant institutions; they will find a decision as long ago as the reign of Charles I that an institution by the Chancellor of St. David's, even with the wrong seal, was good: no Bishop invoked; and, what is more, no complaint made, by a man who clearly wanted to get rid of the institution, that the whole proceeding was irregular because the Bishop himself had not done it. But I can tell you something more; because, by good luck, the patents of all the Chancellors and Vicars General were printed by the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission; and I find that in no less than six dioceses, and, as it happens, three in each province, Canterbury, London, Durham, Carlisle, Worcester, Chester, the patents of the Vicars General expressly recognise—I say “expressly” for a reason that I will give presently—the duty of the Vicar General to grant institutions if the Bishop does not want to do it himself. But the notion now is that the Vicar General is incompetent to do it! I say that every law book you can read says he is competent to do it; and I say further that in the diocese of Canterbury the Archbishop generally does not do it, and in the other dioceses it is entirely optional with the Bishop whether he will do it or not. In some of the other patents it is left open; that is to say, the powers and duties of the Vicar General are declared to be what they have been in the time of their predecessors; and, inasmuch as you cannot have two laws about the same ancient office, you must look and find what the old law was, and then, whatever the Bishop may do or say in a particular place, the Vicar General has the old power; he is the judicial officer; he comes under the Acts which transferred all spiritual jurisdiction to the Crown; and the Bishop has no more power to

diminish his duties or his rights than he has to increase them. Therefore, although some of the patents, in evidently modern words, except the power of institution, I say that the whole of this allegation is founded upon a mistake. It is an entire mistake to suppose that institution to a living cannot be given by anybody but a Bishop. In the case of a donative (and nobody knows how many they are) the Bishop does nothing. Moreover, my Lords, I can tell you a fact that will astonish many of you—Your Lordships probably, most of you, are under the impression that a man is made a Bishop of a See by the Archbishop of the Province. He is not. I ought to know, because I have had to read the Queen's mandate at a good many consecrations. The Archbishop is not ordered to consecrate him Bishop of any See; he is ordered to consecrate him a Bishop. If he is translated from one See to another, or from no See at all to a Diocesan See in England, that is done entirely by the Crown: either by letters patent in the case of the new Bishops—rics where there are no Deans and Chapters; or, if there is an election by the Dean and Chapter, it is done, as you know, under *Congé d'élire*; but further (which perhaps everybody does not know) if there is any mistake, or neglect, in obeying the *Congé d'élire*, the Crown can do it at once by letters patent. It is only the Crown therefore that gives any episcopal jurisdiction at all. If that is the case in regard to Bishops, it is surely asking us to swallow a good deal to ask us to believe that the personal intervention of the Bishop is necessary for institution. And so ends the whole of this claim, which is notoriously and obviously put forward by the High Church party, and is totally unfounded. I alluded a little time ago to a much higher authority than myself upon the question of the rights of the two Convocations to interfere in matters of this kind, except by petitions to Parliament, like anybody else. I find that my noble and learned Friend opposite me (the Earl of Selborne) in 1874, and I think again in 1881, said (confirming Archbishop Tait):—

“I am not aware of any single occasion on which any Statute of the Realm has been passed

*Lord Grimthorpe*

on Ecclesiastical Courts or their procedure, when there has been any concurrent action of Convocation.”

My noble and learned Friend also used lately, in an important, though not exactly legal, body called the House of Laymen, of which he is Vice-Chairman, some very strong language about that very thing that I have been speaking of a little time ago—the English Church Union resolutions—however, I will not at this time of day stop to quote it. My noble and learned Friend is here, and he will recognise that I am correct. My Lords, not only he, but on more than one occasion Lord Cairns expressed very strong views against any recognition of Convocation, except in the one case in which I agree that they ought to be recognised—namely, the alteration of the services. When the Shortened Services Act, as it is popularly called, was passed, it was expressly referred by Her Majesty to Convocation—not to vote upon as a legislative body, but to report, as had been previously done by a Royal Commission. I do not question in the least the right of Convocation to petition either House of Parliament, or to report to Her Majesty when she desires them to do so. But I do entirely protest (to use my noble and learned Friends' language in substance) against their claiming any right to intervene in legislation. But, my Lords, I must also mention another person—not perhaps of so great legal weight as my noble and learned Friend, but of greater weight from other points of view—I mean the noble Marquess below me (the Marquess of Salisbury). In 1874, on the Public Worship Act, Convocation and the clergy generally protested against any interference by Parliament in far larger numbers than they have done at present. So they did on the Burial Bill of 1880—16,000 of them, besides the Convocations, protested, and you may see some of the threatening letters, as I may call them, which Archbishop Tait received, in his *Life*, which I suppose many of us have been reading lately. What said the noble Marquess in 1874?—and this is specially noticed, I see, in *Archbishop Tait's Life*. He said: “The

claim of Convocation" (to interfere with a Bill of that kind) "is entirely new"; and either then, or on another occasion (for I cannot quite make out from the book which it was) he said, "I protest against the competency of Parliament to deal with Clergy Discipline being denied." How could you have a stronger declaration against the interference of Convocation than those of Lord Cairns, of my noble and learned Friend opposite, and I must add, of the noble Marquess? Yet the strange thing is that, after all that, it is Her Majesty's Government who have taken upon them to alter your Lordships' decision of last year, in which they concurred, and some of them actively, and to say, practically, to the laity of England, "You shall not have a Clergy Discipline Act unless you will consent to alter the law of England, and let the Bishop be the person to declare, or refuse to declare, a living vacant after the incumbent has been convicted and sentenced." My Lords, I shall not trouble myself to move Amendments to this Bill. If Her Majesty's Government choose to go to the country with this declaration that the Protestant Church laity of England shall not get rid of bad clergymen without consenting to this first step in clerical aggression, that is their look-out, and not mine.

\*THE EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, my noble and learned Friend, in the speech which he has just addressed to your Lordships, has gone into topics of very wide range, of which I should be the last to deny the importance. He has said many things with which I agree, and some things with which perhaps I may not agree; but I do not think it necessary on this occasion to define either the limits of my agreement with him or the points upon which I may not agree; because it really does seem to me that nearly the whole of my noble and learned Friend's speech was not strictly relevant to the Bill which is now before your Lordships. (Hear, hear.) Certainly, if your Lordships ever had occasion to consider the pretensions advanced by the body, which has no public authority, to which my noble and learned Friend has referred, and whose recent manifesto he went

into in some detail, I am afraid that with all the respect which I feel for some members of that body, I should be found very much in agreement with my noble and learned Friend as to those pretensions. (Hear, hear.) But I do not think there is anything in this Bill which gives encouragement to those pretensions, or which those who advance them could claim as originating with them—I am totally unable to find anything of that kind. The words of this Bill, upon which my noble and learned Friend has thought it necessary to make the interesting and large comments which your Lordships have heard, are simply these:—That when a temporal Court has pronounced a certain sentence in cases which the Act defines, the preferment, if any, held by the clergyman should, without further trial, be declared by the Bishop to be vacant, as from the date at which the conviction becomes conclusive. Now there are two classes of cases dealt with *uno flatu* by these words. One, as my noble and learned Friend has said, has been the subject of legislation already by the Treason and Felony Act of 1870, which Act declares the benefice of a clergyman convicted of treason or felony to be actually void; and, notwithstanding what has fallen from the noble and learned Lord, I must declare my agreement with the most rev. Prelate, who said that there is nothing in this Bill which, if it passes into law, will repeal a syllable which is in that Act; if this Bill should pass into law, in the exact form in which it is now before the House, the effect of the Act of 1870 will continue to be what it is now,—namely, to make the benefice *ipso facto* vacant upon conviction of treason or felony; and that being so, I am unable to see what there is inconsistent with that Act in saying that upon that state of things arising the Bishop shall declare the benefice to be vacant. The law says it is vacated, and what inconsistency with that law there can be in saying that the Bishop shall declare it to be vacant, I am at a loss to understand; and I can well believe that, not merely upon those somewhat imaginative grounds to which my noble and



learned Friend has referred, and which may open, as it seems to me, a very unnecessary field of controversy, but independently of those grounds, and for very plain, simple, and practical reasons, it may be a proper, and in some cases a very desirable thing, that the Bishop should declare a living to be vacant which the law has already made vacant in a certain state of circumstances. In cases of treason or felony, in all probability the matter may have some notoriety; in the other class of cases with which this Act proposes for the first time to deal, namely, misdemeanours, it may, or may not be so; but anyhow, it seems desirable that the vacancy should be formally and officially declared and recorded. Whether the importance of this, from any point of view, is greater or less, if anyone thinks it, for practical or even for sentimental reasons, to be desirable that the Bishop should make a declaration in conformity with the law and with the policy of the law, what there can be in that to rouse a storm of speculative objections I cannot conceive. If it pleases anyone I am content to do it for the sake of removing a difficulty, for the sake of removing opposition, for the sake, it may be, of satisfying even scruples with which I do not agree. If that in any quarter will tend to conciliate men's minds and remove opposition to a measure, which all agree to be in substance necessary and desirable, for my part I sincerely hope that such degree of consideration, even for men's weaknesses, will not appear to Parliament to be a compromise of any principle.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: My Lords, there is at least one satisfaction to be found in the speech of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Grimthorpe)—that he has certainly found out in the Bill every little weakness that it can possibly have, and that you have before you the whole indictment that can be possibly brought against it. I cannot help feeling that it was very unfortunate that the noble and learned Lord was not consulted about this particular clause, or that he had no share in framing it. Those who had that responsibility would have been able then to deal with and weigh his objections before

*The Earl of Selborne*

the matter came into Parliament. But after what has been said by the noble and learned Lord who has just spoken, I do not think that any of us who are not lawyers, at least, can attach very grave importance to the tremendous difficulties which the noble and learned Lord has found in this Bill. For in the greater part of the noble and learned Lord's speech he was not discussing the Bill at all; he was discussing the utterances of an utterly irresponsible body, and not dealing with the provisions contained in the words of the Bill itself; and, in so doing, I think he has obscured the real points at issue, and made difficulties to arise from the utterances of that society, which have not their origin in the Bill itself. My Lords, it is not my part to follow the noble and learned Lord in a discussion of all the enactments of past times which have dealt with this subject or with cognate subjects; but yet I could not help being struck by the fact, when he made a complaint against the powers given to this Rule Committee in matters of procedure, that he at least ought to have remembered that in the Act of the 38th & 39th Vict., which constituted the Supreme Court of Judicature, the very word "procedure" is used in connection with the rules which were to be drawn up by that Committee, and they were not enacted in the Act itself. Further than this, the noble and learned Lord spoke of institution as a matter belonging really to the Vicar General, and he went into very learned arguments to prove that it is so; but I should like the noble and learned Lord to tell us whether any Vicar General could institute where there was no Bishop, or where there was nobody holding the position of the Bishop during the vacancy of the See. Is not the Vicar General in every case acting for the Bishop, and is it not the Bishop who institutes? *Qui facit per alium facit per se*. As regards the matter of the intervention of the Bishop, with which the noble and learned Lord finds so much objection, he must remember that from our point of view, whatever it may be from the point of view from which he regards it, the preferment of a parochial clergyman consists of two

parts : it involves the freehold that he possesses during the time he holds his office, but it involves also a spiritual element, which we call the cure of souls. Now, I hold that no Civil Court either does or would wish or profess to affect the spiritual cure of souls, but it claims, and rightly claims, the power to deprive of the preferment. As the noble and learned Lord has pointed out, the preferment is vacant whether the Bishop declares it or not ; but the Bishop desires to have the privilege, which belongs to his office, of declaring the cure of souls to be vacant, and of relieving the clergyman of that tremendous spiritual responsibility which the Bishop committed to him on the day of his institution. As regards this institution, I do not know into what dioceses or what histories the noble and learned Lord has looked, or what acquaintance he has with the practice of the present day—

LORD GRIMTHORPE : I said I had looked into the report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK : I can only say that during the 14 years of my own episcopate I have, in every instance, excepting when I have been absolutely prevented by circumstances, instituted the clergyman myself, and have never once asked the Vicar General to do it ; and I propose to carry on that practice to the end of my episcopate, unless the noble and learned Lord can convince me, which he has not yet done, that I am wrong in so doing. What then the Bishop desires, and what in the Bill we are very thankful to find he is permitted to do, is to pronounce a clergyman incapable of handling a cure of souls if the Civil Court has deprived him of his preferment, and the freehold involved in it. And is there nothing similar to this, my Lords, in other professions, if I may so speak of my own calling ? Does the noble and learned Lord not know anything of disbaring ? Is it not the case that for certain offences, for which a lawyer is convicted by a Civil Court, after such conviction the legal authorities proceed to disbar that lawyer or to strike him off the rolls ?

LORD GRIMTHORPE : It is mere surplusage.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK : It may be mere surplusage, but it is what takes place ; and, if it takes place in the profession to which the noble and learned Lord belongs, surely it is not a very unreasonable desire upon the part of a Bishop ? The noble and learned Lord suggests that possibly the Bishop might refuse to do this. What would be the circumstances ? The living is vacant, whether he refuses or agrees.

LORD GRIMTHORPE : That is a mistake ; the living would not be vacant under the Bill.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK : I will not argue that point of law with the noble and learned Lord ; I think that other lawyers of authority differ from him on that point ; but in any case, supposing the Bishop refused, all that he could do would be to deprive himself of one of the privileges and prerogatives of his office ; for it would be impossible for him to retain in his living a clergyman who had been found guilty of any of these crimes, and the living would become actually vacant, although the words do not remain as in the Bill of last year, "*ipso facto vacated*" by the sentence of the Court." My Lords, I would say one word in conclusion—not that there is much to say after the exhaustive speech of my most rev. Brother,—but on behalf of the northern province I do most earnestly implore your Lordships to pass this Bill, and to pass it as it now stands before you. I do not mean without some modifications of detail—I am sure my most rev. Brother and myself are quite willing to accept such modifications if they are likely to make the Bill more practicable ; for what we want is not an ideal Bill,—we want something now, and we do not get ideals just at the moment when we want them ; we want something that will work and help us to get rid of these few, these very few unworthy clergymen who are found in our body, without being led into that interminable delay and incalculable expense which has attended the operations of the law in such things in the days that are past.

LORD HERSHELL : My Lords, I desire, in saying a few words in support of this Bill, to express my conviction that this measure rests upon a broad basis, and appeals widely for support in

that it deals with a matter in which not alone the Church of England is interested—because that ministers of religion should be enabled, under the existing law, to remain in charge of a parish or a living when they have been guilty of notorious misconduct and ill living, is an injury to religion itself, no matter what the sect or denomination. (Hear, hear.) Supposing that you have a man of this sort living in a parish, in charge of the parish, as representing the Church of England there, can anybody doubt that his very existence there will be a stumbling block in the way of every minister of religion in the place? The Nonconformist minister, who is endeavouring to bring men to a belief in the truths of religion, or to enforce upon them the morality of religion, finds the existence of such a person living in the midst of those whom he is addressing a serious hindrance to his work. Therefore, it seems to me that it is a mischievous and evil thing, far beyond the bounds of the Church itself, that such a state of things should exist, and that there should be no speedy and simple means of removing it. And, my Lords, I would go further, and I would say that, apart even from questions of religion, it is a mischievous thing as regards the interests of morality itself, because a minister of religion is teaching religious truths intimately connected and associated with moral obligations; and can any one suppose, for a moment, that, even as regards mere moral influence, that moral influence will not be diminished, and the young very likely be freed from restraints which otherwise they might be led to regard, on account of a scandal of this sort existing in a particular part of the country? Therefore, my Lords, it appears to me that there are grounds, quite apart from any grounds of the interest of the Church or the advantage to the Episcopate, in the reduction of the expenses of prosecutions, upon which support may be claimed for this Bill. No doubt, my Lords, there are those who are opposed to a measure of this description, because they are opposed to the existence of a Church establishment, and think that there should be a separation between the Church and the State; but I would

*Lord Herschell*

venture to suggest, even to them, that it is worthy of consideration whether it is not paying too high a price for any advantage that might be gained to the cause which they have at heart, to put an obstacle in the way of removing a scandal of this description, which is injurious to religion and morality. I am quite certain that if the time comes for the Church to be disestablished, its disestablishment will not rest upon a certain number of scandals existing in different parts of the country, arising from an immoral or a criminal clergyman; if the day should come, it will rest upon a much broader basis, and much wider considerations than these; and they themselves would be the first to rest it, and they do rest it upon such broad considerations. Therefore I trust that there may be a disposition to regard this measure upon its merits, as one in which all who have the interests of religion and morality at heart may find a common ground for the purpose of removing an evil which is injurious and mischievous to all. Now, my Lords, with regard to the criticisms of my noble and learned Friend opposite, I should like to say just a word or two. I am certainly not deeply impressed with the views which have found expression in the document to which he has alluded; but, on the other hand, I must frankly confess that I am not deeply convinced either by the arguments which my noble and learned Friend has produced as to the evil which would be done by yielding, if there be a yielding, to the extent contained in this Bill. I look at the thing from a practical point of view. I cannot see myself that there is any danger in giving, if it be an additional power, such additional power to the Bishop as is given by this Bill. What is it? It is only to say that, under certain circumstances, in the case of particular convictions, the Bishop shall declare the living vacant. Well, my Lords, I do not think that a duty of that sort, arising under the provision of an Act of the Legislature, is a recognition at all, certainly not of any serious kind, of any such principles as my noble and learned Friend suggested are involved in it. But, my Lords, I think there may be really a distinct advantage in requiring this

declaration, and for this reason: This Bill extends the findings of temporal Courts, which are in effect to render the living vacant, because they are to lead to the Bishop declaring it so. At present that exists only in the case of treason and felony. The Bill extends it to certain serious misdemeanours. But the more you extend provisions of that description, the more possible it is that the conviction may not be a matter of notoriety to everybody; and there does seem to be a distinct advantage in requiring of some one a public declaration which shall make it, in each case, a matter of notoriety to those concerned and interested—amongst others to the patrons of livings—that the living has become vacant; because, of course, the living becomes vacant from a particular time; and if it becomes so merely by reason of the conviction, the right of the patron would accrue at that time, and his right might lapse, possibly, without the matter being brought to his notice. Therefore I think there is an advantage in the provision that some official should make a public declaration of the avoidance of the preferment; and I cannot see any more appropriate person than the Bishop of the diocese. Therefore there seems to me a practical advantage in it; and I do not feel myself that, whatever view one may take upon the question, that has been a good deal discussed, there is any admission of which anyone need be afraid. I would only suggest to the most rev. Prelate whether it might not be desirable to provide that, in case the Bishop failed, within a certain time to be limited (it must be a short time) to do it, it should be done by the Archbishop or the Vicar General—for this reason: that it is certainly a thing which should be speedily done. You might have a case, where the Bishop was ill, and not in a condition at the time to make the declaration; and, therefore, I think there is a reason for making a provision of that sort, which would probably be an additional safeguard gratifying to the noble and learned Lord opposite, and would, I think, be an improvement upon the Measure as it stands. And, my Lords, I would only say this, with regard to the apprehension that the

Bishops might refuse, and be liable to mandamus: that Bishops are liable to mandamus now for many acts that they have to do. In fact, cases of *mandamus* to a Bishop are within one's own experience. If a Bishop refuses to institute, when he is bound to, he may be made the subject of, and is liable to mandamus; and, as my noble and learned Friend will know, there have been instances of mandamus to a Bishop for refusal to do an act which, by the law, he is bound to do.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: If my noble and learned Friend appeals to me, he probably alludes to the Gorham case—

LORD HERSCHELL: I was thinking of *Marshall v The Bishop of Exeter* at the moment; that was a case of mandamus.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: In the Gorham case you know the Bishop did not do it.

LORD HERSCHELL: Still with a provision of this sort I am not afraid of the Bishop not doing it. I do not think we shall be driven to a mandamus; but, after all, if a mandamus has to be applied for, and is applied for, when a man has been convicted of a grave offence, and the statute has said that the Bishop should declare the living vacant, if the Bishop refuses to declare it vacant and goes to the extent of defying the law, I do not think there is any party who will have any great sympathy with him, or any great regret if he is made to obey the law. My Lords, I will not trouble you with any further observations upon the details of the Bill; but I desired to state the grounds on which I give it my hearty support.

Motion agreed to; Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

#### SMOKE NUISANCE (METROPOLIS) BILL—[H.L.]—(No. 9).

##### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

\*LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: My Lords, last year when I

rose upon this subject, having upon four previous occasions discussed it at considerable length, I moved the Second Reading in a very perfunctory manner. The result was so much controversy that although the Bill was read a second time I acknowledge the necessity of going to-day into the question with greater accuracy and precision. At the same time I will not detain your Lordships longer than is necessary, especially after the serious debate which has taken place and from which it may seem an undue descent to pass to any lighter topic. In consequence of the black fogs which occurred consecutively for five days about Christmas there has been lately a good deal of popular attention drawn to the subject. At that time the hunting world,—for frost occurred simultaneously,—being driven up to London might well have murmured at the darkness that awaited them; at the same time the skating world was under great impediments as it was scarcely possible to move to the ice in the vicinity of London. Now as these two worlds contain men of every class from the highest to the humblest, there can be no wonder at the feeling which existed and still continues to exist. The noble Marquess, the First Minister, and the noble Viscount sitting usually behind him (Viscount Midleton), who questioned him not long ago, appear on this important subject to have opposite opinions. According to the noble Marquess it is useless to correct fogs as you would only change the colour. According to the noble Viscount it would be possible to eliminate the essence of fog altogether as well as to remove the dark and solid particles which are now unfortunately added to it. My Lords, I hold a middle view between these two, as it appears to me, extreme opinions. I hold that it is possible to remove the black and solid particles but that it is beyond, at least the present grasp of science to deal entirely with fogs that spring not only from the exhalations of the river but also from the exhalations of the ocean. But in order to convince Her Majesty's Government that it is worth while at least to eliminate the peculiar blackness which smoke must add to fogs, I would refer for a moment to some other cities. It is notorious

*Lord Stratheden and Campbell*

that fogs exist in other cities, but that the blackness and malignity of which we complain is entirely peculiar to our metropolis. I happened to witness a fog quite recently at Hamburg, which is in some degree analogous to London. It is the second city and the great port of the German Empire; it is on a tidal river, not far from the mouth of it; it is exceedingly commercial, but not exclusively commercial. The fog there set in and lasted two or three days, and may be going on still; but as a witness of it I could mention that in consequence of its being confined to mere unblackened vapour, it had in it nothing at all to interrupt the traffic of the place, and nothing which could be injurious to health if due precautions were adopted. However that may be, my Lords, I think all men must admit that a campaign against the artificial must precede the campaign against the natural ingredients, that you must first direct your legislation against the peculiar element which we superadd to fogs existing here alone, and then aspire, perhaps, either by further drainage or by undiscovered agencies to combat the element itself in which fog originates. But there is something else to be remembered. The attention of the public has been drawn to fogs of late, and very justly; but fogs are not at all the only evil which this kind of legislation is intended to control or to diminish. If by the efforts of the noble Viscount who alluded to the subject fogs were entirely removed, you would still have the smoke of London; you would still have its effect on flowers, on furniture, on constructions, on health, and on the human system. But that topic I leave to the noble Viscount to consider, hoping that he will bring to bear upon it the impressive eloquence which a few days ago drew down the admiration, if not the envy, of his leader. It has been powerfully treated by Mr. Rollo Russell, whose pamphlets on the subject have entitled him to just and great celebrity. He agrees, I think, with me in a rough estimate that for 20 days of actual fog you have, perhaps, 100 days in which our light and sunshine is obstructed. I will now go on and touch in a few words upon the details of the measure. As framed this year, the Bill adheres, as

far as possible, to the form in which it quitted a Select Committee in the year 1887, comprising the Duke of Westminster, the Earl of Harrowby, Lord Mount Temple, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, the Earl Brownlow, Lord De Vesci, Lord Monkswell, and Lord Dundonald. In compliance with the Public Health Act, which passed only last Session, it is necessary that certain functions should be transferred to the Local Government Board which were originally entrusted to the Home Office. It is also requisite to refer to certain Acts of Parliament which exist instead of others which are abrogated. The executive authority of the Bill will as before reside entirely in the Vestries. The Local Government Board, if the Vestries are inert, will have admonitory powers to impel them, but it will not be able to keep their bye-laws beyond a certain limit in abeyance. There is a special clause, although it was not needed except for clearness, to prohibit all entry into the interior of houses. The Bill dictates nothing to householders, but leaves them to avert objectionable smoke by any method they think proper. It is less disturbing and less drastic than the law as it now exists at Dresden. The law of Dresden, of which I have a copy, gives the authorities control over interior arrangements instead of merely laying down that the householder should do anything he chooses except to permit black smoke to flow out of his chimneys. The Bill, as always, rests on the fundamental principle that the householder is entitled to burn whatever he desires in any mode he fancies, but is not entitled to send into the public air elements which vitiate it. It is a principle which came into existence so long ago as the time of Charles II. who directed Mr. Evelyn, the well-known proprietor of Wootton, the author of the *Diary*, to frame a measure to support it. It is only by the use of coal in its bituminous and uncorrected forms during two centuries that we have become gradually demoralised and have lost sight of the principle, while at the same time our habitations and our thoroughfares have been gradually thrown into an obscurity from which it is now desirable

to rescue them. My Lords, I wish with a view to the satisfaction of noble Lords to answer a question which is nearly certain to suggest itself, although I am not bound to do so by the provisions of the Bill. It is a question as to how the new law would be carried out in practice. I can only give my personal impression that it would be carried out in practice with the greatest ease and with the minimum of outlay, by mixing anthracite and coke rather than by changing and modifying fire-places. Having been much in Germany last autumn, and having opportunities of entering into the subject with the first mechanical inventor, and also in consequence of other observations, and looking also to the movement of the public mind, I learn that anthracite is there regarded as the true and practical solution of the problem. I have convinced myself by some inquiry not only that anthracite may be drawn from Germany and from America but that in the Principality of Wales large stores of it exist which have not been exhausted. But supposing that no effect immediately arises, I should still contend that the Bill will be salutary. It will embody in the Statute Book the principle that domestic as well as industrial smoke requires to be combated. No doubt some further legislation may very possibly be requisite. Amended statutes may be frequent before an absolute solution is arrived at, but that has often been the case on other subjects. I happen to remember the late Sir Robert Peel remarking in the House of Commons that although he had been over thirty years in Parliament he never knew a Session in which there had not been a new Bill for regulating salmon. But he did not therefore draw an inference that legislation upon salmon had been useless. If he had, I am inclined to think that no one who knows the Tweed or any Scottish river would have been able to agree with him. I will now, my Lords, briefly answer an objection of the noble Viscount, to the effect that no Bill upon this subject can be carried unless a Government initiates it. Glad indeed should I have been if Her Majesty's Government

had resolved upon that conduct, But I am bound to point out, as it appears to escape the recollection of some who may exert an influence upon the measure, that the Bill as it left the Select Committee was on the point of being adopted by this House, and there is no proof that it would not have gained the sanction of the other. Her Majesty's Government intended to support it with one or two minute Amendments, which would have been easily accepted. It was then destined to a smooth and unresisted course, so far at least as the Third Reading in this House, when at an unusual stage and in an unexpected manner a noble Earl on the Cross Benches—I think he is absent to-day, I mean the Earl of Wemyss—came forward to oppose it. His oratorical ability was such—and I refer to it without the slightest acrimony—that he carried round the Government, who were induced to swerve from their original design, and resolved upon outvoting it. I recall it merely to show your Lordships that had it not been for something wholly unforeseen, wholly unexpected, and, to a great extent, unprecedented, the labours of that Committee would not have been thrown away, and it is probable, at least, that the law would now be in existence. What tends strongly to urge it upon both Houses is the grave consideration, that unless something is done to improve the air and light of the Metropolis it may not be easy to maintain it as the capital much longer; but that topic is much too large for me to handle it this evening. My Lords, if your Lordships have the goodness, as I scarcely doubt, to read the Bill a second time, I am glad to understand that by the arrangement now in force it will naturally go before a Committee of the whole House. That is my object. I desire that its clauses shall there be freely canvassed and impartially decided on. If a question had arisen as to whether it should go before a Committee of the whole House or before the Standing Committee, I should have had some further observations to address to you, which I am glad that I can properly avoid; and I will now, therefore, merely move that the Bill be read a second time.

*Lord Stratheden and Campbell*

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>."—(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell.*)

\*THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER:

My Lords, I desire to make one or two remarks, and they shall be very short, in the hope that you will be induced to read this Bill a second time. The principle has been accepted on previous occasions by your Lordships, and its objects are twofold—namely, to enable the Sanitary Authorities of London to make bye-laws for abating, or regulating, the emission of smoke of houses and buildings, and those that are not included in the Public Health Act of last Session. The machinery of the present Bill is identical with that of the Public Health Act of 1891, and will apply to the same extended area. Therein, of course, London becomes very much enlarged. The old Acts affect only the inside ring, it may be so called, of London; and there is a very great deal of smoke beyond that ring; and that area is proposed to be included in the present Bill. It affects, as you will observe, the emission of smoke, not only from factories, but from private houses and those very great offenders in the matter of smoke, the hotels and clubs of London. Your Lordships may very often have observed that about luncheon time, at 2 o'clock, Pall Mall is very often over shadowed with a dense pall of smoke coming out from those clubs at that interesting time of day. The second part of the Bill is to enable the County Council to make byelaws, in all cases of new houses, for the construction of fire-places so that they may consume the smoke which arises from them. I hold this to be a very moderate and almost permissive Bill, because it gives powers to Local Authorities for the execution of the Act. As your Lordships are well aware, the evil is increasing, and must increase, owing to the number of additional fire-places that are built every year. It has been computed that the amount of coal consumed in one year amounts to the enormous total of 8,000,000 tons—that is the bituminous coal full of smoke. It is easy to see that that enormous

amount is being increased every year by the increase of population, and the increase in the number of houses in all parts of London. There is also the melancholy consideration, in connection with the case, that there are fogs and fogs—of course country fogs are not so deleterious as London fogs, because the London fogs are thickened and deepened by the amount of smoke that adheres to the globules in the air; but I am sorry to say that by the register the foggy days in 1887 were 93; in 1888, 119; in 1889, 151; and in the year 1890 they amounted to the larger number of 156. All that shows a very increasing state of the evil, and one which this Bill may affect. We cannot expect very much from it; but we hope it may tend to affect it in some slight degree. In regard to the state of the law of prosecutions for offences against the Act, the law at present affects only the industrial chimneys; and it has been considered that there is a spirit of some unfairness when other chimneys, also emitting a great deal of smoke, are let off, and are not subject to the provisions of the law. This question no doubt affects the decision in some cases of the Bench; at all events, the law would be more efficiently carried out if all the chimneys in London were placed so far upon an equality. It is also held that, if this Bill were passed, inventions for the consumption and getting rid of smoke will be very considerably stimulated. Those inventions are being arrived at every day, and I have a line here from Mr. Brunner, M.P., of the large firm of Brunner Mond and Co., Northwich, the great alkali works, where he tells me that 125 tons of slack at 7s. a ton produce in his case four tons of sulphide of ammonium worth £12 a ton. At that rate, 7s. a ton for 25 tons of slack, he makes a total of £43 7s., and by the sale of four tons of ammonia, produced by that consumption of slack, he makes £10 10s. a ton, or £42 10s. That is so far satisfactory and encouraging as showing that, by the production of this very valuable ammonia, no very considerable loss, in fact hardly any loss at all is entailed by the consumption of smoke. At the same time that would not apply, or very slightly, to the question of smoke

consumption in London; but it may fairly be considered to apply to industrial factories. Then there is an increasing consumption of oil in the heating of London, and of gas and coke; and facilities are given by low prices for numbers of poor people to avail themselves of gas and coke. Then again anthracite coal can be obtained in any quantity in the world, both from South Wales and America, where the supply is practically inexhaustible; and I understand that in Paris anthracite coal is used to a very considerable and large extent; and there are restrictions there as to the consumption of smoke; I am not sure what they are, but there are considerable restrictions; with the result that a great deal of smokeless coal, anthracite, and coke (I do not know about gas) is used. The question of the consumption of smoke, my Lords, does not affect us in our position as much as it does the poorer classes of the community; we can get away to purer and fresher air, at all events, occasionally; but the poor cannot, many of them,—the great bulk of them,—are in London day after day, and week after week, through sunshine and through fog; and I think in their interests my noble Friend the promoter of this Bill, and those who wish to see something, however slight (and I do not believe in any very great result from this Bill, certainly not so far as the private grates are concerned), may do some good, and we should be very glad if your Lordships would, under the circumstances of the case, consent to pass the Second Reading of this Bill.

\*THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I will not resist the appeal to pass the Second Reading of this Bill; but the noble Lord who introduced the Bill spoke of indirect pledges of approval. I beg to say beforehand that, by assenting to the Second Reading of the Bill, I give no pledges as to what we may think it right to do at any further stage of it. I cannot help feeling that the noble Lord who has just sat down is indulging in sanguine anticipation, and that the results will not be very large, even if it were possible to carry out



the measures which he suggests; and, if the results are not large, I do not think we shall be paid for losing the comfort of a flaming fire. I was a little alarmed at the proposal of the noble Lord that we should recoup ourselves, for the expense of a new installation, by the manufacture of sulphide of ammonium in our own houses. I do not know whether the noble Lord is familiar with that drug.

THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER:  
No.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It smells more exactly like a drain than any drug I know; and I am afraid we shall hardly thank the reform that the noble Lord has brought in if we are compelled to have much of it about us. However, what I would suggest to the noble Lord is that if we read the Bill a second time he should allow us to refer it to Lord Midleton's Committee, so soon as that Committee is appointed.

Motion agreed to: Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

EAST INDIA OFFICERS BILL [H.L.]  
(No. 10.)

Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3<sup>a</sup> on Monday next.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT, 1881, AMENDMENT BILL  
(No. 17.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read

LORD HERSCHELL: My Lords, this is a Bill to effect certain amendments in the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881. The Bill is similar to, and, I believe, identical with a Bill which passed through the other House last Session, and was read a second time in your Lordships' House; but at a very late period of the Session—in fact at the very close; and, on the Motion to go into Committee, the noble Marquess opposite suggested that the Bill was one of some importance, and that it was too late to deal with it during the Session. My Lords, it has come up early

*The Marquess of Salisbury*

enough this Session for us to be able to deal with it. The Bill contains a variety of provisions—each of them entirely independent; and, therefore, there is no principle involved in the Bill; it is a question simply of the expediency and propriety of each of the several provisions. The first of those provisions relates to cases of forfeiture by bankruptcy or execution; if the property is conveyed to another, within the time limited in the Bill, it avoids the result of bankruptcy or execution, the effect of which will be to preserve to the creditors of the bankrupt, very often, property that is very valuable; because, in some cases, there have been failures in building operations, and the result has been very disastrous to the creditors, owing to the impossibility of dealing with the property in this way. The next provision relates to conditions against assigning or under-letting; it enables the Court to relieve from a forfeiture, by assigning or under-letting, where the permission to assign has been unreasonably withheld, and to prevent money being insisted upon by way of payment for the licence to assign. As your Lordships are aware, the Act of 1881 contains provisions enabling the Court to relieve against certain forfeitures, but excepts the particular cause of forfeiture with which I am now dealing. My Lords, it would not be right to pass a measure of that sort without considerable safeguards. The Bill excludes from this section all agricultural or pastoral land; it excludes mines or minerals; it excludes a house used, or intended to be used, as a public-house; it excludes what I may briefly describe as a furnished house; and it excludes property with respect to which the personal qualifications of the tenant are of importance for the preservation of it. To all those cases the Act does not apply. It only applies, in short, where the personal qualification or position of the tenant is a matter of indifference; and in those cases it provides that the Court may relieve against forfeiture, if the permission to assign is unreasonably withheld. Then there are certain powers inserted for the protection of under-lessees, enabling the Court to give certain

relief, that I need not trouble your Lordships with in detail. The only other provision is to remove doubt as to whether in the Act of 1881 "lease" includes also "an agreement to let"; there has been judicial doubt on that point, and that is removed by that last section. My Lords, as I said before, I believe there are some amendments which it is desirable to propose to the Bill, which my noble and learned Friend (Lord Selborne), who is not here now, has indicated to me, which may have to be considered. I ask your Lordships now only to give a Second Reading to the Bill, which, as I have said, involves no question of principle, but is simply a question of expediency.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, my noble and learned Friend has truly said, I think, that there is no particular principle involved in the Bill; but I am rather anxious to guard myself against the qualified approval that I once gave to the Bill by saying that, upon a more mature and careful consideration of it, I cannot help thinking that there are one or two objections to the form in which it is cast. I will tell my noble and learned Friend at once that I am only referring to that part of the Bill which has reference to conditions or covenants to assign. With respect to the rest of the Bill I entirely concur in its provisions. In the first place, I want to point out that I think the Bill is improperly cast, and ought to be amended in that respect. Instead of making a general proposition, from which you afterwards exclude almost everything (which seems to me a very awkward mode of drafting), the more natural course would be to say that which you intend to be the subject of enactment. But I have a still more serious objection to the form in which the third Clause is conceived; that is, by giving a non-natural and unreal meaning to words which in themselves have a very common and reasonable meaning. It is to be enacted there that "in all leases" and so on—

"Containing a covenant against assigning or underletting"—

I omit any unnecessary repetition of words meaning the same thing—

"Such covenant, condition or agreement shall be deemed to be subject to a proviso to the effect that such licence or consent shall not be unreasonably withheld."

It seems to me that the more natural thing would be, if you mean to prohibit the landlord from entering into such a contract, to prohibit it, and it would be plainly manifest upon the face of the instrument. But to say that people are to contract in words of ordinary common sense, and that the Legislature should put upon it, in a Statute which very few people but lawyers would see, another and entirely different meaning and additional condition, seems to me very unreasonable. I think a more reasonable and rational way of doing it would be to say that in such cases as you want to exclude, it shall not be lawful to enter into any such contract. And, my Lords, one word as to the fourth exception—

"Any property with respect to which the personal qualifications of the tenant are of importance for the preservation of the value or character of the property."

My Lords, I am not quite certain that I am able to comprehend what are the "personal qualifications of the tenant," and I do not quite know whether I am able to define beforehand what is "the value or character of the property." In a hunting county, for instance, would it be a personal qualification of the tenant that he can shoot foxes or anything of that sort? That is one illustration of what I mean. But the things are so wide that the difficulty I have is whether that is not a trap for a lawsuit, and whether, although it looks very innocent in itself, and you would say that it was very unreasonable of a landlord to refuse except where the character or value of the property is affected by the personal qualifications of the tenant, yet, when one comes to analyse it (and I admit that I did not myself at first consider the full effect and value of those words), I confess it looks to me very much as if it would be a very interesting Debate, possibly in a great number of Courts, as to what it meant; and, although that might be very interesting to the learned profession, it might not be so interesting either to the tenant or the landlord. My Lords, I have thought it only right to call attention to this matter. I

agree with my noble and learned Friend that there is a good deal that is of value in this Bill which I should be sorry to see lost; but I think that in the Standing Committee it would be very desirable to see whether some construction cannot be put upon those words to prevent their being made really a trap for people getting into lawsuits without really knowing that they were in dispute at all.

**LORD HERSCHELL:** My Lords, I shall, of course, be glad to consider the points to which my noble and learned Friend has called attention, and I quite agree with him that there may be improvements made in the drafting of the Bill. It arises, as my noble and learned Friend knows, I daresay, from this: that the Bill is introduced in a certain form, and various proposals are accepted from opponents of the Bill, so as to satisfy them; and then the result is that it comes up with everybody satisfied, but not always, consequently, in the best possible form.

Motion agreed to: Bill read 2<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

#### NEW PEER.

Sir Arthur William Acland Hood, G.C.B., Retired Admiral of Her Majesty's Fleet, having been created Baron Hood of Avalon in the county of Somerset—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

#### ELECTRIC AND CABLE RAILWAY BILLS.

Message from the Commons, That they have come to the following Resolution, namely—

That a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons be appointed to consider the best method of dealing with the Electric and Cable Railway Schemes proposed to be sanctioned within the limits of the Metropolis by Bills introduced, or to be introduced, in the present Session, and to report their opinion as to whether underground Railways worked by electricity or cable traction are calculated to afford sufficient accommodation for the present and probable future traffic; as to whether any, and which, of the schemes propose satisfactory lines of route; as to the terms and conditions under which the subsoil should be appropriated; whether any, and, if any, what schemes should not be proceeded with during the present Session; and to desire their Lordships' concurrence thereto.

The said Message to be taken into consideration to-morrow.

*The Lord Chancellor*

#### STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.] (No. 29).

A Bill for further promoting the revision of the Statute Law by repealing enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary.

#### MARRIAGES ABROAD BILL [H.L.] (No. 30).

A Bill to consolidate enactments relating to the marriage of British subjects outside the United Kingdom: And

#### PUBLIC AUTHORITIES PROTECTION BILL [H.L.] (No. 31).

A Bill to generalise and amend certain statutory provisions for the protection of persons acting in the execution of statutory and other public duties.

Were presented to the Lord Chancellor; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed.

#### ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL BILL [H.L.]—(No. 5.)

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3<sup>a</sup> to-morrow.

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL [H.L.]—(No. 4.)

Moved, That the Order of the 22nd of February last negativing the Standing Committee be rescinded.—(*The Lord Chancellor*); agreed to; and Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee.

#### SHORT TITLES BILL [H.L.]—(No. 12.)

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

#### PRESENTATION TO BENEFICES BILL [H.L.]—(No. 24.)

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3<sup>a</sup> to-morrow.

#### SALE OF GOODS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for codifying the Law relating to the sale of goods—Was presented by the Lord Herschell; read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed. (No. 32.)

#### ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Law in regard to bridges in Scotland"—Was presented by the Lord Ker (M. Lothian); read 1<sup>a</sup>; and to be printed (No. 33.)

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 3rd March, 1892.

## PRIVATE BUSINESS.

WESTMINSTER (PARLIAMENT STREET, &c.) IMPROVEMENT BILL  
(by Order.)

## SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed,  
"That the Bill be now read a second time."

\***(3.9.) MR. DIXON - HARTLAND,** (Middlesex, Uxbridge): I rise to oppose the Second Reading of this Bill. It is no new proposal; it is the prolongation for some three years more of exceptional powers granted to private individuals, with a proposal to withdraw the safeguards which the Act of 1887 possessed. By that Act it was arranged that a certain company should be formed with £500,000 capital, of which £100,000 was to be paid up as a safeguard for the carrying out of the work. Well, five years have elapsed and no company has been formed, and not a penny of the capital has been subscribed. I may say from my own knowledge that the promoters have been to almost every financial authority in the City of London to try and get their case taken up; and the financial authorities, having examined the question, have decided there is no chance of any profit being made; and one and all have utterly declined to have anything to do with the scheme. Why is this the case? Because when the Bill was before Parliament, to buy off opposition, an enormous number of agreements were recklessly made, regardless of results should the company ever be formed—the object simply was to buy off opposition. But now they find that, so long as these agreements exist, it is impossible for the company to be successful in any possible way. We are told that the First Commissioner of Works is in favour of this scheme, and I do not wonder at it if that is so. If I were First Commissioner I should help on

the Bill, because the Board of Works is one of the parties bought off with an agreement. No doubt if the scheme could be carried out it would be a good thing for the Board of Works; but at the present moment it is really a short-sighted policy on the part of the Board of Works, because to continue the existing agreement would simply hamper the Department, and render it impossible to make terms with a *bona fide* company. Certainly this company will never be able to carry the scheme through. If any profit is to be made it certainly will not be made by the present promoters, and the scheme is not one that should be left to be carried out by private individuals. This is the finest site in the whole of the Metropolis. If the front part of a piece of Parliament Street were removed, and the Public Offices extended from the Local Government Board through the land which belongs to the Government up to George Street, I say it is one of the finest sites you can possibly have in this Metropolis, and if the work were taken up by a responsible body a very great improvement would be carried out. But I contend there is now no prospect of it being carried out, and to pass this Bill is simply to lock up the site for a still further period of time. I notice that the name of the Cadogan Estate Company has been imported into the case; but I do not see what that company has to do with it. That company is in no way bound by the Bill, and is merely introduced as a kind of stalking-horse to make the House of Commons believe that if the Bill passes this company will see their way to have something to do with it. But the mention of the company is deceptive, for the company are under no obligation. It is a company with no capital whatever. I believe the whole of that company's work was carried on by means of debentures, and the company have no capital to carry out the undertaking even if they wished to do so. The Cadogan Company have carried out improvements on the land they acquired from Lord Cadogan; but then that estate was vacant: but this ground is covered with buildings of a valuable description. We are told that

the company may raise money on debentures; but that will mean ground rents 50 per cent. above any other rents in the immediate neighbourhood. It is perfectly impossible that they can get any financial authority to take up the debentures saddled with the conditions they will be obliged to make—conditions which were entered into when the Bill was last before the House of Commons, and for the purpose of buying off opposition. If this Bill is passed in its present form it will do away with all the protection to public and private interests which Parliament has thought necessary. This is an attempt to do away with Clause 4, which is the only protection the public have that the scheme will ever be carried out. I believe all the owners of the property in the neighbourhood are opposed to the hanging up of this site for another three and a half years, for they are convinced that the body of gentlemen who are promoting this Bill, however well-intentioned, are unable to carry out the scheme. A Petition has been presented to this House by the Institute of Civil Engineers, in which they say they are owners of three of the largest houses in Great George Street, and that they are in treaty for the acquisition of another adjoining (No. 27), and they propose to pull the whole down and to erect a large building for their institute on the site. All this will be stopped for three years if this Bill is granted, and though they might not object to that if they had an assurance that the scheme would really be carried out, they protest that there is no chance of this being done. I hope the House will not read this Bill a second time, not because the House is opposed to the scheme proposed, but because the position of the promoters is such that the scheme can never be carried out.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

\* (3.20.) *MR. GILES* (Southampton): This is called a Westminster Improvement Bill, and it would be a great

improvement to remove the block of houses between Parliament Street and King Street, but there is not the least necessity for the creation of a new street from the middle of the Foreign Office quadrangle to Westminster Abbey. In the carrying out of this design valuable properties would be destroyed, amongst others the building forming the Institute of Civil Engineers, which has existed for 75 years, and which has a frontage of over 120 feet. This Bill has been before the House in 1887 and in 1890, and the powers have lapsed. The promoters, who are simply impecunious speculators, are now trying to renew these powers, to the prejudice of all the inhabitants dwelling in the neighbourhood. It has been decided by the Institute of Civil Engineers to rebuild their property, but are they to wait in a state of uncertainty for another three years, and with, as they think, no chance of the scheme being carried out?

\* (3.21.) *COLONEL MAKINS* (Essex, S.W.): So far as I gather, nothing has been said against the principle of the Bill, and that, I understand, is the subject of debate on a Second Reading. A great deal of what has been said by hon. Members may be perfectly true; but the question as to whether or not further safeguards are necessary for the protection of private interests is a question for the consideration of the Committee to whom the details of the Bill will be referred. Now the history of the Bill is not quite that given by the hon. Member for the Uxbridge Division (*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*). The object of the Bill now before the House is to bring back the position to what it was when the Bill left this House in 1887. The 4th clause, on which so much stress has been laid by the hon. Member, was inserted at the last moment in the House of Lords at the instance of Sir Richard Nicholson, clerk to the Middlesex County Council and an occupier in the district, who is also the leader of the present opposition. Sir Richard Nicholson's position is this: he made an agreement with the promoters of the Bill for the protection of his own interests, and at the last moment he got this clause put in. The promoters took it and have since honestly

*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*

endeavoured to carry it out, but now the object of the Bill is to get rid of the 4th clause, because the promoters find it is impossible to raise the money in the way provided—that is, by subscription of £500,000 in open Stock. Investors will not subscribe to an undertaking of this kind in open Stock, but they will take Debentures with a contingent claim on profits if hereafter made. The hon. Member has alluded to the Cadogan Land Company, and the connection of this company with the matter is simply this: they have succeeded in carrying out, I will not say a precisely similar, but in most respects a similar undertaking; they have made great improvements on the Cadogan Estate in Cadogan Square and Lennox Gardens, which they have converted into one of the handsomest quarters of London, and what has been done once can, in all probability, be done a second time, and if it should not be done, those whose interests are concerned are protected over and over again in most cases by agreements, and they have also the ample protection of the Lands Clauses Act incorporated into this Bill, which safeguards can, if the Committee think necessary, be increased and extended; and, lastly, they have this protection, that no property can be taken until the money is provided. The alarm expressed by my hon. Friend is, therefore, exaggerated. He says he does not want to have this matter hung up for the next three years. Nor do the company wish to have the scheme hung up for the next three years; but, unfortunately, through the action of the opposition, the scheme has been hanging since 1887, owing to the very clause it is now sought to remove. I do not wish to trifle with the House, and I therefore say that if the clause be re-enacted neither the promoters nor the Cadogan Company could possibly undertake the scheme. If, therefore, the House should be of opinion that the safeguards provided by the 4th clause are necessary and ought to be inserted, then the House had better throw out the Bill at once, for it will be absolutely impossible to carry out the improvements. It is not necessary to say a word in favour of the improvements. They are most desirable. That

is admitted. The only question is, who are to do them? In the Petition presented by the hon. Gentleman on behalf of those whom he represents, it is asserted that the improvements ought to be carried out by public authority. Well, the London County Council have been approached, and their opinion is that the work ought to be done by the Government. They decline to undertake the widening of Parliament Street: they say it is more an embellishment than a public improvement, and they say it should be undertaken by the Government: and I daresay the right hon. Gentleman will tell us that the Treasury are not prepared to find the money. So it follows that the only other resource is a private company which will act under the powers of the Bill if the House will grant them. The Government look with benevolence on the undertaking, because they have acquired considerable property, which now lies idle, which they cannot deal with, but which under this scheme they can make useful to the public service; but, in any case, before they allow a single step to be taken, they would have to be satisfied, and would be satisfied, that the promoters were able to carry out their intentions. The last day for petitioning has gone by, and two Petitions only have been presented. One of these is from the gentlemen who are represented by the hon. Member who has spoken, and the other is from the Middlesex County Council. The Chairman of the County Council informs me that they look with favour on the project, and that theirs is merely a watching Petition, so as to get a further safeguard, should it be found necessary, in Committee. This is really a matter of procedure. The nature of the improvements intended is well-known, and it is for the House to decide whether the Bill should pass this stage, whether the Bill of 1887 should be re-passed without the fatal clause introduced in the House of Lords, so as to enable the company to carry out this much-needed improvement. I do not know what the Chairman of Ways and Means may have to say on the subject, but it appears to me the question raised by my hon. Friends are wholly questions for Committee, and that they have not

at all attacked the principle of the measure, which is the question to be decided by the House now.

(3.29.) MR. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): A short time since papers and plans in relation to this scheme were brought to me. I examined them, and I found that the ideas of various leaseholders were so capacious that I could see no chance of carrying out the scheme so beneficial to the neighbourhood. Any hon. Member who has examined the matter must come to the conclusion I have arrived at, that this locality is one of the grandest quarters in the whole of London. It might be made an embellishment to the Houses of Parliament, to Westminster Abbey, to the whole Metropolis. But I do object to the House of Commons being made the means of foisting a company on the public. Not a penny of capital has been subscribed, and when the project was put before me, and I found that the House was to be asked to assist in floating the company, I would have nothing to do with it. I hope the House will not pass the measure until perfectly convinced that the capital has been found. If there are gentlemen interested in these improvements, let them find the money and make their profit in the best way they can, and not come to the public to subscribe for a purpose out of which they will never get a penny.

\*(3.30.) THE FIRST COMMIS-  
SIONER OF WORKS (MR. PLUNKET,  
Dublin University): As the Depart-  
ment I have the honour to represent has  
been referred to, perhaps the House will  
allow me to say a few words. As to  
the prospects of the scheme as a com-  
mercial undertaking I express no  
opinion whatever, and as to whether  
the Bill is a proper one in its details,  
that is a question, I think, for the decision  
of a Committee upstairs. So far as the  
Department of Works is concerned we  
are, speaking generally, satisfied with  
the proposals contained in the Bill. My  
hon. Friend who moved the rejection of  
the Bill spoke of our having been offered  
extravagant terms, but I think there  
was exaggeration in his remark. We  
have been offered what I consider  
are fair terms, but no more than fair

terms. Then as regards the proposi-  
tion that a project of this kind should  
be taken up by the Government, I  
myself should be very glad could I  
foresee any chance of it, but I am  
afraid I cannot hold out any immediate  
hope of that. I will give the House  
the reasons that induce me to give my  
support to the Second Reading, but  
I do not wish to put any pressure upon  
any hon. Member who sits on this side  
of the House to vote with me. It  
seems to me that the proposals  
in this Bill having passed through  
Committees of both Houses within  
the last few years is a circum-  
stance that should induce us to  
regard this Bill with favourable con-  
sideration, and if an alteration intro-  
duced, as we have been told, at the last  
moment in another place has made  
the success of the undertaking  
impossible, inasmuch as it was  
attaching to it an unworkable con-  
dition, then I do not think it  
is improbable that some other plan  
may be devised which would provide  
the security which I fully admit the  
persons interested are justified in ask-  
ing for; therefore it seems to me  
the Bill should be allowed to  
go before a Committee. If the  
scheme can be carried out success-  
fully, I certainly agree it will confer an  
enormous advantage on this part of the  
Metropolis, not only because the traffic  
at the point is fearfully congested to an  
extent that is a danger to the  
public, but looking at it from another  
point of view, I think the condition  
of Parliament Street is a scandal to  
the Metropolis. I never walk down  
that street without wondering how  
it is that it has been so long left  
in its present condition. Parliament  
Street does not unite, so much as it  
separates, two of the finest sites exist-  
ing in any capital in Europe. At the  
one end you have Whitehall Place and  
Charing Cross, and at the other end  
the venerable Abbey of Westminster  
and the buildings of the Houses of Par-  
liament, two magnificent public places  
separated, I say, at the present time by a  
narrow insignificant street. The Bill  
under other circumstances was con-  
sidered a good one, and I see no reason  
why a Committee upstairs might not be  
able to put in such terms as, while allow-

*Colonel Makins*

ing this import: public improvement to be carried out, would provide all security for the private interests concerned.

(3.35.) MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central): I have no intention of opposing the Bill, and if, as the result of passing the Bill, Parliament Street is widened, and handsome buildings erected, no doubt a great public improvement will be carried out. But I may remind the right hon. Gentleman and the House that it was originally intended, many years ago, that the widening of the street should be effected by the Government, and that the War Office should be built in the front street. That intention was abandoned when, later on, it was agreed that the War Office and the Admiralty should adjoin each other on the Admiralty site. Then, as the Government no longer wanted the site in Parliament Street, the plan of leaving the carrying out of the improvements to a company seemed to be a wise one. But since then, again, the scheme for uniting the Admiralty and the War Office has been abandoned, the Admiralty being in course of building on the site by itself. But it will be necessary hereafter to build a new War Office, and it seems to me there are only two possible sites—the one in question and the one opposite the Admiralty in Whitehall—and so it becomes matter for serious consideration whether it is wise for the Government to part with the property the site of which is, I believe, on the whole, about the best remaining site for a new War Office. It is a matter for the Board of Works to consider whether it is altogether wise to entrust the carrying out of this scheme to a private company. I merely throw out the suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. PLUNKET: With the permission of the House, I may be allowed to say that this very point has been carefully considered by the Office of Works; and if the scheme were successfully carried out, it would greatly facilitate the application of the site the right hon. Gentleman has referred to, to the erection of a new War Office or any other public building considered necessary.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Then I understand it is not intended abso-

lutely to part with the site—that the Government will retain some kind of lien upon it?

(3.38.) THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. COURTNEY, Cornwall, Bodmin): The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) has intervened with a special question, not, indeed, without warrant, and I thoroughly sympathise with him in regretting that the War Office and the Admiralty are not united upon one site in Spring Gardens. I still think that it would be well to have the new War Office near the Admiralty, so that the two arms of the Military Service of the Crown may be close together. But I do not think, in view of what has just been said, that any adequate reason has been advanced for not referring this Bill, in the ordinary course, to a Committee, arising from the course that may be adopted in regard to the new War Office. The question is now, Shall we send this Bill to a Committee or not? Those who have opposed the Bill have some ground for their opposition. The projectors of the scheme got their Bill in 1887, and their powers were renewed in 1890, but practically nothing has been done from that time to this. Those who are interested and concerned in this matter are the Institute of Civil Engineers and house owners in the neighbourhood, who not unreasonably may complain of being left for many years in an uncertain position. They do not know whether it is best to make alterations and improvements in their buildings, or whether or not they may be liable to be turned out at short notice. Of course, the whole question turns upon facts, and the promoters now propose to give a guarantee that they will within a short time carry out their plans. They say they are able to lay before the Committee an absolute guarantee that they will be able to proceed with the work subject to the preliminary Certificate of the Commissioners of Works; that in twelve months they will proceed with the work or abandon it altogether. On the other hand, the hon. Member for Stepney (Mr. Wootton Isaacson) assures us that he has private information, and his view is shared by the hon. Member for the Uxbridge Division (Mr. Dixon-Hartland) that the promoters are not



in a position to carry out their plans. But are we competent here, on the floor of this House, to determine the question? I have the greatest regard for the accuracy of the judgment of the hon. Member for Uxbridge, and I pay due deference to the opinion of the hon. Member for Stepney; but I do not think that what those hon. Members have said can be accepted as conclusive upon points of detail which can only be decided upon examination of financial facts and the evidence of financial experts. They will bring their *data* before the Select Committee, and the Committee will decide in the usual course. But the facts cannot be ascertained here; and if we are to proceed with reasonable caution, we must refer these matters of detail to a Committee upstairs. If the Committee are not satisfied from what is laid before them, that the future fortunes of the scheme will be different from what they have been in the last five years, the Committee will report against the Bill, but we cannot decide here and now whether the plan is hopeless or not. The merits of the plan as a public improvement are admitted, and the Board of Works, after full examination, are favourable to it. I hope the House will allow the Bill to follow the ordinary course, and that the Committee will be left to decide questions a Committee alone can decide.

MR. WOOTTON ISAACSON: Would the right hon. Gentleman favour a proposal that the scheme should be held up for less than three years?

(3.46.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 228; Noes 14.—(Div. List, No. 16.)

Bill read a second time, and committed.

MANCHESTER, SHEFFIELD, AND LINCOLNSHIRE RAILWAY (EXTENSION TO LONDON, &c.) BILL (*by Order.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Courtney*

(3.59.) MR. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.): If, Sir, I do not oppose the Second Reading of the Bill now and wish to move the Reference of the Bill to a Hybrid Committee, should I be able to make that Motion now or at a later date? I mean supposing the Bill is unopposed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill, if unopposed, will be read a second time and referred to an ordinary Select Committee. It will be open to the hon. Member to move the discharge of the Order for reference to a Select Committee, and to move that the Bill be referred to a Hybrid Committee.

MR. BOULNOIS: Shall I be able to do that now if the Second Reading is unopposed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Question now is the Second Reading, and whether this is opposed or not a subsequent Motion may, as Opposed Business, be deferred to a later day.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

MR. BOULNOIS: Then, Sir, I give notice that to-morrow I shall make the Motion for the Reference of the Bill to a Hybrid Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should in terms make his Motion now.

MR. BOULNOIS: I beg to move the Motion which stands in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be nominated by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection.

That, subject to the Rules, Orders, and Proceedings of this House, all Petitions against the Bill presented on or before the 27th February last be referred to the Committee; that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, Agents, or Witnesses be heard upon their Petitions if they think fit, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

That Four be the quorum."

MR. HENEAGE (Great Grimsby): I object. I would suggest that it be taken this day week.

MR. SPEAKER: It would stand over till to-morrow in the usual way.

Debate adjourned till To-morrow.

MR. BOULNOIS: I beg to give notice that to-morrow I shall move—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee to consider, if they think fit, whether, if the Railway is shown to be required, the proposed approach to London, and the district in which the terminus is to be placed, is the most suitable, regard being had to the character of the particular site and the neighbourhood, the means of access thereto, and the convenience of the Metropolis generally."

### QUESTIONS.

#### EXPENSES OF INDIAN MILITARY EXPEDITIONS.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he can state to the House what progress has been made in preparing the Return regarding expenditure incurred by the Government of India beyond the north-west frontier of India in military expeditions and explorations, and upon military railways and roads, notice to move for which Return was given last July, and with regard to which he stated, on 24th July, that communications would be addressed to the Government of India, and that "all details compatible with the public interest will be given;" and if he can say when it is likely that the Return will be presented to the House?

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir JOHN GORST, Chatham, for The Under Secretary of State for India, Mr. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The special collection and tabulation of the figures of the various departments from the Accounts for the past ten years is being made. The Secretary of State is not able to state when the Return is likely to be presented, but he is informed that it is difficult and laborious, and causes a heavy strain on the staff of the Secretariat.

MR. BRYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell me in what form the Return is to be made? He undertook last Session to give me an idea of the form in which the Return would be asked for.

\*SIR JOHN GORST: I am afraid the hon. Gentleman must apply to my successor for information on that point.

#### POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate when the Government are to introduce the Police and Public Health (Scotland) Bill; and whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to arrange that the Bill may be read a second time before Easter?

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Sir C. J. PEARSON, Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): In reply to the first part of the question, I hope in a few days to introduce the Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill, to which, no doubt, the hon. Member refers. The question of when it may be read a second time, will depend on the progress made with the Public Business already before the House.

#### FAMINE KITCHENS IN INDIA.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Secretary of State for India has been directed to the following paragraph from the *Times* Correspondent, dated Calcutta, 28th February, and appearing in the *Times*, 29th February—

"According to a Madras telegram the collector at Kinnoul reports that women of the higher castes will not resort to the famine kitchens. The Famine Commissioner, however, thinks they should be given a chance of attending before that opinion is formed;"

and what course the Government of India intend to take in the matter?

\*SIR JOHN GORST (for Mr. CURZON): The Secretary of State has seen the telegram. The next sentence in the *Times* telegram to the one quoted by the hon. Member, would appear to show that the opening of special relief kitchens for these classes was under consideration. The Famine Code makes full provision to meet these cases, and there is no need for special inquiry.

#### THE INDIAN CENSUS.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether, considering the importance of much of the information contained in the Returns of the late Census of India, and the difficulty of procuring those Returns here, Her Majesty's Govern-

ment will cause to be presented to Parliament such parts of those Returns as are most likely to be of interest and value in this country?

\*SIR JOHN GORST (for Mr. CURZON): The only tabulated results of the Indian Census were given as an Appendix to the last Moral and Material Report. The final Report is not expected for some months, and when it is received the Secretary of State will consider in what form the information can best be made public in this country.

#### PROPOSED CADASTRAL SURVEY OF INDIA.

MR. MAC NEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Reports of the Government of Bengal and the Government of India, and the Orders of the Secretary of State regarding the proposed cadastral survey of Behar, can be laid upon the Table of the House along with the Reports of the Divisional Commissioners and District Officers who were consulted by the Government of Bengal regarding the introduction of the present measure; and whether, considering the general indebtedness of the zemindars and ryots in Behar, the Government of Bengal will proceed with the cadastral survey, which will lead to additional expense?

\*SIR JOHN GORST (for Mr. CURZON): If the hon. Member will move for the Papers, the Secretary of State will present them as an unopposed Return. The Secretary of State considers it necessary, in the interests of the ryots, to proceed with the survey. He has received no representations as to the general indebtedness of the zemindars.

#### THE ROYAL NIGER COMPANY.

MR. W. H. CROSS (Liverpool, West Derby): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to a statement in the *Times* of 9th February, of Lord Aberdare, the Governor of the Royal Niger Company, Chartered and Limited, to the effect that Her Majesty's Government have exacted from that Company the amplest information as to the application of the administrative revenue; whether, in view of the special

provisions contained to that end in the Royal Charter, the Government have yearly exacted full and verified particulars of the incidence, collection, proceeds, and application of all revenues raised by the Royal Niger Company: whether the Government will now lay these Returns before this House, together with particulars of what, if any, modifications have from time to time been suggested to the Company by Her Majesty's Secretary of State; and whether such suggestions have been duly carried into effect?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): There is no provision in the Charter for a yearly examination. It is stipulated that the Company shall furnish accounts from time to time as may be directed by the Secretary of State. The statement made by Lord Aberdare is correct. In 1888, Major Macdonald, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, personally examined every branch of administration, inspected the police force, visited the stations and ascertained the amount of Government work done by the Fleet. Some modifications in the duties have been made with the sanction of the Secretary of State, and a Return will be prepared and laid, similar to that laid in 1888, as soon as the requisite information can be obtained.

#### THE SHETLAND TELEGRAPH CABLES.

MR. LYELL (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether it is true, as reported, that both the telegraph cables to Shetland are broken; and, if so, when one or both of these cables will be repaired, so that telegraphic communication may be restored?

#### THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

(Sir J. FERGUSSON, Manchester, N.E.): When the hon. Member gave notice of this question, both cables to Shetland were broken; but the direct cable from Sinclair Bay in Caithness-shire was repaired yesterday, and the cable ship of the Department will now proceed to repair the local cable from the Orkneys.

Mr. Bryce

## THE CASE OF P. W. NALLY.

MR. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the disorderly conduct of which the late Mr. P. W. Nally was alleged to be guilty, and for which he was deprived of some of his good conduct marks, consisted of a protest at Downpatrick Railway Station against being forcibly brought to England to give evidence against Mr. Parnell and the Irish Members before the *Times* Commission; what was Mr. Nally's general conduct whilst in prison; what was the entire length of time he was in prison, including the period he was, through no fault of his, awaiting trial; and what is the time an ordinary convict would be allowed out of a term of ten years if he conformed to the prison rules?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): The General Prisons Board report that Nally was punished on the occasion in question not for any protest, but for having shouted in a loud and disorderly manner calculated to create a disturbance, and no force whatever was used in bringing the prisoner to England, as he was merely escorted there under the order of the Special Commission Court. Beyond the case mentioned, he does not appear to have infringed the prescribed prison rules. He was ten and a quarter months in custody before trial, and he served seven years and seven and two-thirds months under his sentence of ten years' penal servitude. A convict undergoing ten years' penal servitude is, under the prison rules, released on licence at the end of seven years and eight and a quarter months from the date of the commencement of his sentence, provided that his conduct has been invariably good.

MR. HAYDEN: Did Mr. Nally make any protest against being brought to England?

MR. JACKSON: As I understand the question, it is whether he was punished for having made a protest. He was not, but for disorderly conduct, which consisted of shouting loudly in a disorderly manner.

VOL. I.

[NEW SERIES.]

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.): Was not the disorderly conduct the singing of "God Save Ireland" at the railway station while he was being removed?

MR. JACKSON: I do not know whether the disorderly conduct consisted of the use of any particular words, but it was perfectly well known that prisoners in these circumstances ought not to have shouted at the railway station while being removed.

Subsequently,

MR. M'CARTAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether any professional gentleman was instructed to represent the Crown at the Coroner's inquest held on the remains of P. W. Nally, who died in Mountjoy Gaol; and whether he will have laid upon the Table of the House copies of the depositions taken at the inquest, and also a copy of the verdict of the Coroner's Jury?

MR. JACKSON: I am informed that no professional gentleman appeared on behalf of the Crown at the inquest on Mr. Nally. As regards the second paragraph I have caused inquiry to be made, and so far as we know there is no official copy of the depositions or of the verdict.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): What information does the right hon. Gentleman now propose to lay before the House to enable the House to consider the circumstances of Mr. Nally's death; and also with regard to the statement that the Crown was not represented, I would ask what is the law and practice on the representation of the Crown at inquests on men who die in the custody of the Crown?

MR. JACKSON: That is a question which should be addressed to the Attorney General for Ireland. No counsel were specially engaged on behalf of the Crown.

MR. SEXTON: There are two questions I have to ask. First, what means the House is to be afforded to allow it to judge whether the officials of the Crown were blameworthy in reference to the death of Nally; and, secondly—and I address this to the Attorney General for Ireland—what is the law and practice as to the Crown

3 Z

being represented by professional gentlemen with a view to securing a record of the causes of the death of a prisoner dying in the custody of the Crown?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. MADDEN, Dublin University): There is no such law, nor is there an invariable custom for the Crown to be represented at inquests on the death of persons dying in the custody of the Crown.

MR. SEXTON: An inquest was ordered in this case to determine whether the man came to his death by the blameworthy action of others. Does the Attorney General justify the Crown not being represented at the inquest so as to secure a record of the proceedings, so that now we have no record of them?

MR. JACKSON: I understand it is not the duty of the Crown to engage professional assistance in such cases. This was a perfectly simple case, and was referred to the Coroner in the ordinary course.

MR. P. O'BRIEN: Did the Crown find legal assistance at the inquest in reference to the suicide of the late Mr. Ridley?

MR. MADDEN: Yes; that is my recollection.

MR. P. O'BRIEN: Why was that course not adopted in this case?

MR. SEXTON: I shall take the earliest opportunity of calling attention to the fact that as soon as this man died the Government showed themselves indifferent to the consequences.

#### HAULBOWLINE DOCKYARD.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether steps will be taken to facilitate the erection of the machinery and other plant necessary to make Haulbowline Docks available for the purpose for which they were erected; and whether instructions will be issued at an early date to have all necessary repairs to Her Majesty's ships stationed in Irish waters executed in these Dockyards?

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The machinery and plant required in connection with this dockyard is in course of supply. When the dolphins have been erected,

*Mr. Sexton*

the dock will be available for use by ships in emergency. I am anxious to utilise this dock as much as possible, but I cannot lay down a rule that repairs in the future must be executed at a certain place, unless the nature and extent of the repairs are well known, and the capacity of the dock admits of it.

#### NEWCASTLE (COUNTY DOWN) HARBOUR.

MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, with reference to the necessity for harbour accommodation at Newcastle, County Down, whether he is aware that, according to the Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, of the 41,729 mease of herring, sold at £37,989, and caught along the Irish coast last year, 21,794 mease, which sold at £20,206, were caught in Dundrum Bay on the County Down coast; whether he is aware that Scotch and Manx boats made up the greater number of those engaged in the herring fishery there last season; whether his attention has been called to the last Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, in which they state that "boats cannot get in or out (of Newcastle Harbour) without great risk and difficulty"; and whether, considering that Newcastle is situate at the centre of the coast of Dundrum Bay, he will now inquire if anything can be done to provide Newcastle with proper harbour accommodation?

\*SIR JOHN GORST: I am informed that the Harbour of Ardglass, where nearly all the herrings alluded to were caught and sold, lies to the north-east of, and not in, Dundrum Bay, and that while Scotch and Manx boats frequent Ardglass in large numbers none are believed to use Newcastle. The third statement in the question is correct, but I am afraid that I cannot add anything to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on the 22nd and 25th ultimo.

#### KINSALE HARBOUR BOARD.

MR. FLYNN (for Mr. MORROGH, Cork, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how much of the sum of £11,059 15s. 1d. alleged by the Board of Works, Ireland, to

be due by the Kinsale Harbour Board is principal and how much interest; whether compound interest has been charged; and, if so, will he have the rebate of 1 per cent. promised on 29th February calculated on the same basis; and is he prepared to state what the rebate, calculated from the date of the award, 23rd April, 1890, to 29th February, 1892, will amount to?

\*SIR J. GORST: Of the sum named, £10,722 15s. 1d. represents the outstanding principal, and £337 represents the outstanding interest. This interest, which had accrued up to the 31st October, 1889, was capitalised under the award of the 23rd April, 1890, and to this extent, therefore, compound interest has been charged. The effect of the reduction of interest now granted will be simply that all interest after the 1st November, 1889, the date covered by the award, will be calculated at 4 per cent. instead of 5 per cent. The reduction on this account from 1st November, 1889, to 29th February, 1892, will, I am informed, amount to £256 17s. 2d.

MR. FLYNN: May I ask if it is possible for the Treasury or the Board of Works in Ireland to relieve a portion of the compound interest which has been charged at 5 per cent.?

\*SIR J. GORST: I do not see my way clear to disturb the award which was made as from the 1st November, 1889.

Subsequently,

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the usual rate of interest charged by the Irish Board of Works to the different Public Bodies in Ireland on advances in connection with public works; and if the interest charged on the Kinsale Harbour Authorities will be reduced to the lowest rate charged by the Treasury?

\*SIR J. GORST: The usual rate of interest on loans for Public Works which are granted, as in the present case, under general powers and not under special Acts was originally 5 per cent., it is now 4 per cent. The interest on the Kinsale Harbour loan has accordingly been reduced to the lowest rate charged by the Treasury for such loans.

#### THE VACCINATION COMMITTEE.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the Report of the Select Committee on Vaccination in 1871, recommending—

“That whenever in any case two penalties or one full penalty have been imposed upon a parent, the Magistrate should not impose any further penalty in respect of the same child,”

and of the fact that Section 10 of the Vaccination Bill of 1871, legalising this recommendation, was carried in the House of Commons but rejected in the House of Lords by eight votes to seven, he will now introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee of 1871?

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE, Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I hardly think the hon. Gentleman can be serious in asking the Government to bring in a Bill to give effect to the recommendation of a Select Committee which sat 21 years ago upon a subject on which a Royal Commission is at present sitting.

MR. CHANNING: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Interim Report ordered by the Royal Commission is likely to be issued?

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am not aware that such a Report was decided upon. I referred to the Secretary of the Commission on the question put to me the other day on the subject, and I understand it will receive their consideration, but I am not aware that they have come to any decision in the matter.

#### CLARE CONSTABULARY FORCE.

MR. SEXTON (for Mr. Cox, Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the County Clare is entitled to a constabulary free force of 363 men; that the free force at present amounts to only 344; and that the extra force numbers 144, at a cost of £6,000 a-year to the ratepayers; and whether he will now consider the advisability of withdrawing the extra force from the county; and whether the cess in County Clare was not higher than any other county in Ireland?

MR. JACKSON: I have no information before me with regard to the last part of the question, and therefore I cannot answer it. With regard to the other part of the question, the hon. Member is under a misapprehension. The police force to which County Clare is entitled, according to the last triennial re-distribution made by Order in Council in May, 1891, is 344 men. The present force in the county is 144 men, and the charge against the county for the force is at the rate of £5,000 per annum. The number of the extra force serving in the counties is, as I have already stated, carefully considered from time to time, and when the circumstances warrant such a course a reduction will be made. The question of reducing the extra force in County Clare is now under consideration.

MR. SEXTON: As the county cess is now 8s. in the £1, is there any cause why this enormous extra force of 144 men should be employed? Has Colonel Turner recommended any reduction?

MR. JACKSON: I have already said in my answer that the state of County Clare is being inquired into. Whenever circumstances warrant a reduction a recommendation to that effect is generally made to the Authorities, and is usually adopted.

#### KERRY COUNTY CESS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) (for Mr. SHEEHAN, Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the fact that the county cess in Kerry at the present time is 5s. 3d. in the £1, and the poor rate 2s. 3d. in the £1, thus bringing the gross taxation payable by the ratepayers up to 7s. 6d. in the £1, while the average taxation of the whole of Ireland is only 3s. in the £1; whether 295 policemen in excess of the legal free quota are at present stationed in Kerry at great yearly cost to the taxpayers; and what is the reason for this large extra police force in the county, having regard to the declarations of the County Court Judges at the various Quarter Sessions that the county is in a peaceable and orderly condition?

MR. JACKSON: I understand that in 1891 the county cess in Kerry was about 4s. 8d., and the average poor rate 2s. 4d. The question of reducing the extra police force in the various counties is considered from time to time, and a reduction made whenever practicable. The Police Authorities, who are responsible for the preservation of the peace in Kerry, report that the present number of police there cannot be reduced.

#### IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' PENSIONS.

MR. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (for Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the pension age for ordinary National School teachers begins at 55, the maximum age being 60, whilst the pension age for the teachers of the Model Schools begins at 60 and reaches the maximum at 65; whether there is any reason for the difference; and if it would be possible to assimilate the pension rules of the Model School teachers to those of the ordinary class?

\*SIR J. GORST: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer this question. The rules for both classes of teachers were originally the same, and the ages for retirement still remain the same. In 1885 the ordinary teachers were allowed to retire on the maximum pension if they had served 4 complete years from the age of 21 in the case of males, and 18 in the case of females. The Model School teachers, at their own urgent request, are allowed to pay high premiums and to earn higher pensions. I do not think that either class would wish to lose the benefit then accorded to them.

#### FINTONA POLICE BARRACKS.

MR. COGHILL (for Mr. T. W. RUSSELL): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is proposed to remove the police barrack at Fintona, County Tyrone, from the Main Street to King Street; and, if so, what are the circumstances which necessitate the change?

MR. JACKSON: The Constabulary report that it is the case that efforts are being made to obtain another house

for the police barracks, their object being to secure a position more central than the existing one, and nearer to the markets.

#### HIGH SHERIFFS' EXPENSES.

**MR. COGHILL** (for Mr. T. W. Russell): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government have recently received resolutions complaining of the practice of requiring land-owners in Ireland to bear the expenses attendant upon the office of High Sheriff; and whether, in view of the altered conditions under which land is now held, the Government intend to legislate upon this question?

**MR. JACKSON**: The Government have received resolutions complaining of the expenses attendant on the office of High Sheriff, and are now considering whether some means can be found to remove or mitigate the expenses complained of.

#### THE CONTRACT FOR LOAN AND LEDGER PAPER.

**MR. SYDNEY BUXTON** (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a contract for loan and ledger paper has been given to the firm of James Spicer and Sons; whether any portion of the contract has been sub-let to Messrs. Turner, Symons, and Company, Tuckenhay Paper Mills, Totnes, and whether he is aware that Messrs. Turner pay those they employ considerably below the rate of wages usually recognised as fair for those engaged in the manufacture of hand-made paper?

**SIR J. GORST**: No such contract has been given to the firm in question since the 13th February, 1891; nor, so far as I can ascertain, for some years previously. The second and third questions accordingly fall to the ground.

#### PENSION AND SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES.

**MR. F. S. STEVENSON** (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he would object to a Motion for a Return,

showing the total amount expended during the year by Local Authorities upon pensions and superannuation allowances, together with the total amount paid out of the local taxation account for the same purpose?

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. MATTHEWS, Birmingham, E.) (for Mr. RITCHIE): If the hon. Member has in view the expenditure of the year ending 29th September, 1891—that is, the police year—the Returns can be given; but if he means the financial year ending 31st March, then the figures for that period must be obtained. The total amount paid out of the local taxation account in respect of police superannuation will be found in Return No. 373 recently issued by the Local Government Board.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF MARINES IN HARVESTING.

**MR. LOGAN** (Leicestershire, Harborough): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he is aware that during corn harvest of the years 1890 and 1891, a farmer occupying at Walmer was permitted to employ Marines at 1s. 6d. a day to get in the harvest and serve the threshing machine, whilst agricultural labourers of the district were unemployed because the farmer in question declined to pay the wages current in the district and paid by his neighbours; and if the Admiralty will take steps to prevent the men of Her Majesty's Naval Service being used as instruments to reduce wages in that or any other district?

**\*LORD G. HAMILTON**: Upon the application of certain farmers in the neighbourhood of Walmer who stated that they could not obtain civilian labour, 25 Marines in 1890 and 19 in 1891 were permitted by the General Officer commanding the South Eastern district to assist in getting in the corn harvest in those years. In 1891 the want of civilian labour was coupled with continuous wet weather, which threatened to render the corn useless unless quickly harvested. It is believed that Marines are paid the same rate of pay as that given to civilians employed by the farmers. The Regulations admit of the employment of Marines in harvest work provided that the employment of



the population is not interfered with, and that no strikes or disputes exist between farmers and their men. I am not aware that the conditions imposed upon the employment of Marines have been in any case infringed.

#### THE MCKINLEY TARIFF AND THE WEST INDIES.

MR. SUMMERS (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Reciprocity Treaty which has been made between the United States and several British possessions in the West Indies has led to considerable loss of revenue in the British Colonies affected; whether he is aware that in Trinidad, when the Estimates for 1892 were laid by the Governor before the Legislative Council, it was stated that there was an estimated loss of £15,000 under the McKinley Tariff negotiations; whether he is aware that on 8th January, 1892, the Legislative Council of Trinidad met *in camera*, and imposed additional taxation to the extent of £44,000, including an increase in the Import Duty on textiles of 50 per cent.—namely, from a 4 per cent. to a 6 per cent. *ad valorem* duty; whether he is aware that duties upon textiles fall to a very large extent on British manufactures; and whether Her Majesty's Government will use such influence as they may possess to prevent the effect of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States from being this: that whilst it will diminish or abolish duties levied on American products it will at the same time lead to an increase in the duties imposed on British manufactures?

\*SIR JOHN GORST (for Baron H. DE WORMS): The answer to the first four questions is generally in the affirmative; but the increased duty on textiles is only estimated to produce £6,000 of the £44,000 named, and a duty of 6 per cent. *ad valorem* is certainly not high when compared with the rates levied in most of the Colonies, to say nothing of foreign countries. Her Majesty's Government will certainly endeavour to secure that the effect of the arrangement to which the hon. Member refers shall not be to increase the duties levied on British manufactures. But the fair

comparison is not as the hon. Member puts it, between America and British products, but between duties on food and duties on manufactures from whatever countries they may come.

MR. SUMMERS: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Government approves of this increase of taxes?

\*SIR JOHN GORST: I am afraid I cannot answer the question without notice.

#### THE DEATH OF BULWUNT RAO OF INDORE.

MR. SEYMOUR KEAY (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he will now state the result of the trial of the persons charged with the murder of Bulwunt Rao, formerly an official of the Indore State, in the town of Ujain, on 19th May last; whether one of the persons implicated belonged to the railway police, under the control of the Government of India; whether he is aware that Mr. Inverarity and other English counsel of eminence, who defended the prisoners at a cost of Rs.30,000, stated in Court that they were employed for that purpose by the Maharajah Holkar, the Ruler of Indore; whether he is aware that a copy of the record of the trial has been refused to the widow of the murdered man by the British officer who presided over the Court; and whether the Government of India propose to institute an inquiry into the real origin of the crime?

\*MR. CURZON: The special Judge, appointed by the Gwalior Durbar to try the case, found that the Indore Superintendent of Police had bribed the Gwalior police to connive at the forcible removal of Bulwunt Rao from the City of Ujain; that there was no direct intention to cause death, but that in removing Bulwunt Rao violence was used which caused his death. The Judge found four of the accused guilty of homicide, not amounting to murder, who were sentenced to 14 years' rigorous imprisonment; five guilty of abetting that offence, of whom one was sentenced to 14 and the other four to seven years' imprisonment; and two guilty of abetting the bribery of a police constable, of whom one was sentenced to

six months' imprisonment and the other to a fine of Rs.200. Four persons were acquitted. One of the convicts—sentenced for 14 years—was a railway constable in the service of the Government of India. The Secretary of State has no information as to the 3rd and 4th clauses of the question. So far as the Secretary of State is aware, the Government of India do not propose to institute any further inquiry in this matter.

#### THE PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT.

**MR. KEAY:** I wish to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Treasury has yet made the rules mentioned in Section 27 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, and when such rules will be laid before Parliament?

**MR. JACKSON:** I have already answered several questions that have been addressed to me upon this question. The rules are practically settled; but there was one small point remaining which I think has been settled to-day, so that I hope to be able to publish the rules at once.

#### TRAFFIC IN THE WEST END.

**COLONEL BLUNDELL** (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the change which has taken place both in the pace of heavy traffic and in the weights which horses are required to draw at the West End of London since wood pavement has been put down; whether his attention has been called to the cruelty to horses resulting therefrom, especially on hilly ground, whenever the wood pavement becomes slippery, either in frosty weather or after a sudden shower of rain; and whether he will consider the propriety of having the regulations bearing on such matters reviewed, or regulations made if none exist?

**MR. MATTHEWS:** I am informed by the Commissioner of Police that he is not aware of any general change in the pace of heavy traffic since wood pavement was laid down in the streets, although it is possible that the lightness of draught on the wood pavement has tended in some degree to accelerate the pace. The Commissioner has recently

addressed a communication to the Vestries and the County Council, stating that the police had been instructed to give information when any of the streets or thoroughfares are in a slippery state, in order that these Authorities may take action by putting gravel on the roadway. Neither the Commissioner of the Police nor I have power to make regulations as to the condition of the roadway. The police do deal effectually with cases of cruelty to horses.

#### THE CASE OF THE CONVICT CLARKE.

**MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN:** I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when was the insane convict Clarke removed from Portland Prison to Broadmoor Asylum; is he aware that Clarke was perfectly sane when removed from Chatham to Portland last December; will he inquire whether his present insanity is in any way due to the severity of the treatment in Portland; is he aware that he had a black eye on the 20th February; and will he state how he received the blow?

**\*MR. MATTHEWS:** This prisoner was removed from Portland Prison to Broadmoor Asylum on the 26th February. He was thought to be sane on his admission to Portland, but within a month it became necessary to place him under observation. I have already informed the hon. Member that there is no ground for supposing that the insanity is due in anyway to the severity of the treatment which the prisoner received in Portland Prison. On 20th February he had self-inflicted bruises on his eye and face.

**MR. P. O'BRIEN:** If the treatment of this prisoner was under observation surely you must be able to say how the prisoner got the black eye. I am told he was beaten by a warder.

**MR. MATTHEWS:** That is not my information.

#### TRAWLING IN GALWAY BAY.

**COLONEL NOLAN** (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the majority of the fishermen living near Galway Bay desire

that trawling should be prohibited in the whole or part of Galway Bay; if trawling is prohibited in Belfast Lough, Dublin Bay, and most of the Scotch bays; and if he can state the reasons why the wishes of the Galway fishermen should not be acceded to?

MR. JACKSON: The Inspectors of Fisheries report that it is probable that the majority of the fishermen living near Galway Bay, who follow line fishing, desire the prohibition of trawling in that bay. The Inspectors carefully inquired into the subject in 1888, and decided not to make a bye-law prohibiting trawling in this bay. An appeal against their decision was heard before the Privy Council, at which both the line fishing and trawling interests were represented by able counsel, the result being that the Privy Council upheld the decision of the Inspectors. The prohibition in Belfast Lough appears to apply to a portion of it only, and to be confined to night trawling, and for three months of the year only. Trawling is prohibited in Dublin Bay. The Inspectors have recommended the prohibition of trawling in Galway Bay from steam vessels, and the case is before the Lord Lieutenant. They do not propose to prohibit trawling from sailing vessels there, as from the result of their inquiries they do not consider that course necessary.

#### CARLOW BARRACKS.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is a fact that the Military barracks at Carlow have fallen into a dilapidated condition owing to their being occupied only during the Militia training season; and whether these barracks were repeatedly used as Cavalry barracks?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Nothing is known in the War Office as to Carlow barracks being in a dilapidated state. I will cause inquiry to be made. It appears that a troop of Cavalry was quartered in these barracks during the winters of 1888-9 and 1889-90.

*Colonel Nolan*

#### TELEGRAPH STATION AT RATHVILLY.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the frequent applications which have been made to the Post Office to obtain a telegraph station at Rathvilly, County Carlow, will be considered; and, if practicable, the request of the people of the district granted?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: A telegraph office at Rathvilly was offered to a local proprietor in September, 1887, under a guarantee of £34 a year; but it is possible that since then the circumstances may have altered, and I will have renewed inquiry made, and let the hon. Member know the result.

#### THE DOCKYARD STAFF AT HAULBOWLINE.

MR. HAMMOND (Carlow) (for Dr. TANNER): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether there exists at present any dockyard staff at Haulbowline, Cork Harbour; and, if so, in what numbers as regards specified crafts; and whether it would now be possible to dock and repair any seagoing warship in these docks; and, if not, when will it be possible?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The present authorized staff at Haulbowline is: one store-houseman; three shipwrights; one blacksmith; one store labourer, and 14 other labourers. Provision has also been made for employing additional labour as required for coaling work and for repairing, and for maintaining yard machinery, to the extent of about six workmen for the year. It will be possible to undertake small repairs as soon as arrangements have been made for facilitating the entrance of ships and the supply of certain machinery, &c. This will be early in the ensuing financial year.

#### THE MILITARY FORCES IN BURMA.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statements of Lord Roberts at Rangoon, in the *Times*, of the 26th instant, in which he urges strongly that the Military Forces in Burma should be definitely removed from the Madras command, and placed directly under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief in India; whether this

opinion is shared by the chief Civil and Military authorities in India; and whether, in pursuance of his statement on the Debate on 17th February, 1891, on the Indian Presidential Commands, Her Majesty's Government will proceed, at an early date, to carry out this re-organisation of command suggested by the Commander-in-Chief?

MR. CURZON: In reply to the first paragraph, I have to say that the Secretary of State has seen the statements attributed to Lord Roberts. As to the second paragraph, the Government of India shares this opinion. With regard to the third, so long as the Presidential system remains in force, it is not desirable to deal piecemeal with questions of commands, or diminish the authority of the Local Government over the troops composing the Armies of Madras and Bombay. At present the Secretary of State is not prepared to undertake the necessary legislation for this purpose.

#### THE IRISH REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE CHICAGO EXHIBITION.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury who is the Irish representative on the Commission for the Chicago Exhibition; what newspapers did they advertise in, and on what dates; what proportion of the grant of £27,000 was placed at the disposal of the Royal Society to organise Ireland; was any Irish artist or architect invited to act on the Committees; and how many Irish applications have been received?

\*SIR J. GORST: I am informed that the Duke of Abercorn is a member of the Royal Commission for the Chicago Exhibition. Advertisements were inserted on the 28th November, the 12th December, and the 26th December of last year in each of the following papers:—The *Belfast Newsletter*, the *Cork Examiner*, and the *Dublin Daily Express*. Also advertisements were inserted in the *Freeman's Journal* and the *Belfast Morning News* on the 5th December, the 19th December, and the 2nd of January, and in the *Dublin Irish Times* on the 25th November, the 9th December, and the 23rd December. I do not know whether any of the Artists or Architects on the Committees are Irish-

men; none were invited as such. No proportion of the £25,000 (not £27,000) was placed at the disposal of the Royal Dublin Society. 23 applications have been received from Irish exhibitors up to date.

#### SOLDIERS AS RURAL POSTMEN.

MR. H. R. FARQUHARSON (Dorset, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the recent arrangement by which pensioners, reservists, and time-expired soldiers are to have preference for appointments as rural postmen is intended to enable such pensioners, though not resident in the district where the vacancy occurs, to be preferred to resident civilian applicants for the post; if so, whether he will consider the case of young farm labourers and others who have always looked forward to becoming rural postmen?

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: The officers of the Department are instructed on the occurrence of vacancies for postmen, porters, &c., to apply to the Regimental District Office where lists of applicants of approved character are kept. These men would naturally belong to the district, but there is no limitation to the source from which they may be obtained. I have thought that the public interest is promoted by the service of the Post Office being supplied by men who have been taught habits of regularity and obedience, and whose intelligence has been developed; while a better class of men will be induced to enter the Army by having the expectation of lifelong employment. In time some 30,000 situations may be thus filled by soldiers who have served their time. The class of young men referred to in the question can qualify for them by accepting such service; and I hope that in consideration of the objects I have mentioned, those who have hitherto recommended persons for such employment will acquiesce in the measure that has been adopted.

#### THE "EAST INDIA (SALARIES)" RETURN.

MR. KEAY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he can state what progress has been made with the Return entitled "East India (Salaries)," notice to move for which was given in April last?

MR. CURZON: In answer to the hon. Member's question, I have to state that the Secretary of State has not received any report as to the progress being made with the Return.

#### BUSHMILLS POST OFFICE.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the letters for Bushmills are sorted in the train; and, if not, whether he will arrange that they shall be in future; whether he has received complaints as to the unsatisfactory postal service to Bushmills now in force; whether he is aware that, in consequence of the delay in delivery of letters, very great inconvenience is caused to people carrying on business there; and whether he will consider the advisability of making the sub-office at Bushmills a post office?

SIR JAMES FERGUSON: Letters for Bushmills are not sorted in the train; the place being still served by mail car from Coleraine, where the mails are made up. Representations have been made, and it is admitted that there is room for improvement. The matter is now being inquired into. It is considered that there is no case for a head office at Bushmills, as only about 1,500 letters a week are received there for delivery.

#### THE GOVERNMENT OF NATAL.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether anything, and, if so, what, has been done to meet the demand of Natal for power of representative government; and whether the Government still consider that all Native affairs must be kept out of the hands of the Colonial Parliament?

SIR J. GORST (for Baron H. de Worms): The question under discussion between Natal and Her Majesty's Government is that of establishing responsible Government in the Colony, representative government having been in force there for the last 35 years. The latest telegraphic information on the subject is that an amended Bill has passed through Committee in the Local Legislature;

but until the text of it is received, Her Majesty's Government cannot say whether it fulfils the requirements which they deem essential. In reply to the second part of the hon. Member's question, I have to say that Her Majesty's Government, whilst requiring certain safeguards for Native interests, have never considered that all Native affairs must be kept out of the hands of the Colonial Parliament.

#### THE VEXATIOUS INDICTMENTS ACTS.

MR. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether his attention has been called to a grievance alleged by editors of newspapers, publishers, and other persons to have been inflicted on them in recent cases by the law concerning libel and other offences within the Vexatious Indictments Acts, inasmuch as when, after investigation by the Magistrate, a charge has been dismissed as "unfounded," or as "one in which no jury would convict," the prosecutor may bind himself over to continue the prosecution, without finding any security to pay the costs in case of an acquittal; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of remedying this defect in the law?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir R. WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): I am aware that cases have arisen in which prosecutors under the circumstances mentioned in the hon. and learned Member's question have been unable to pay the costs. The point is, however, one of general importance, affecting not only the class of cases to which the question particularly refers but to all cases to which the Vexatious Indictments Act applies. I cannot undertake to initiate any legislation dealing with the matter during the present Session.

#### THE LATE LONDON SCHOOL BOARDS.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the count out on Tuesday night, what course the Ministry propose to take as regards granting an inquiry into the conduct of the late London School Board?

**THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY** (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to the hon. Member's question, I have to say that, as far as I understood the situation with which the hon. Member dealt on Tuesday last, the case stands thus:—Charges of extravagance, and more than extravagance, were brought by him in a very able speech against the London School Board, the penultimate Board, or even an earlier one. These facts were brought before the London constituencies when the recent School Board was elected, and I understand that the present Board are pledged to a policy of economy. But if it were the fact that, in order to carry out that policy, they require to carry on an investigation for which they have not themselves the necessary means, and if their efforts to make this investigation have proved fruitless through their not possessing adequate powers, and if they made representations in that sense to Her Majesty's Government, we should seriously consider the new state of things thus disclosed.

#### PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

**MR. CONWAY** (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware of the anxiety of managers of poor Catholic Schools for the introduction of the Bill promised in the Queen's Speech for relieving Public Elementary Schools in England from the pressure of the local rates; and whether he has any objection to informing the House when the Bill will be introduced?

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: This is one of the subjects that the Government are anxious to deal with, but I do not think in the present state of Business it would be either possible or useful immediately to introduce a measure.

#### THE IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' PENSION FUND.

**COLONEL NOLAN** (Galway, N.): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in regard to the telegram read by him the other night—on Monday night—which purported to come from a representative of the National Teachers' Organisation, whether his attention

has been drawn to a communication that appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*, stating that the telegram was not authorised; and, if so, whether the right hon. Gentleman still adheres to the statement that the telegram came from the Teachers' Organisation?

**MR. SEXTON** (Belfast, W.): In order to make this matter clear, I wish to say that I have received a telegram from a member of the Executive Committee to the following effect:—

"Telegram referred to by Mr. Jackson, M.P., was not sent from the Executive Committee, of which I am a member, nor do I know who is responsible for it."

I wish to ask whether he can ascertain as to the correctness of it?

**MR. JACKSON**: No, Sir; I cannot ascertain. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway asks whether I have seen the statement he refers to. Having had time to make inquiry I have to say that I have seen the letter to which he refers; but the hon. and gallant Member asks me if I adhere to the statement I made upon Monday in regard to this matter. Now I do not think that that is a quite right way of putting it—

**COLONEL NOLAN**: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, and withdraw the expression. I intended nothing discourteous; it was only my clumsiness.

**MR. JACKSON**: The telegram I received was handed to me while sitting on the Treasury Bench. That telegram purports to have been handed in at Dublin at 6.20 p.m., and to have been received here at 6.40 p.m. It reads as follows:—

"Executive Committee of Irish National Teachers' Organisation heartily endorses proposed allocation of £91,000 to the Pension Fund."

Signed

O'KELLY, Secretary."

That is all I know about the telegram. This morning I received a letter which I had better read—

"The Irish National Teachers' Organisation,  
Dublin, March 2, 1892."

Sir,—I am directed by the Parliamentary Committee of the Executive of the Organisation to forward copies of Resolutions passed on Saturday last at their meeting. In transmitting the enclosed, I am instructed to express the satisfaction of the members with the various proposals of the Government.

They hope that the Second Reading of the Bill will be taken at any early date. They desire to send a deputation to London during the Second Reading and Committee stages of the Bill, to use their influence with the Irish Members, and to obtain their services. Our Parliamentary Committee was appointed by the Executive, and given full powers to deal with matters Parliamentary during the Session. I have already forwarded the views of the Committee with reference to the allocation of the £91,000."

This letter is signed by Mr. O'Kelly, the Secretary to the Organisation. That is all the information I have upon the matter beyond a copy of the resolution.

MR. SEXTON: The right hon. Gentleman speaks of a telegram received from a Parliamentary Committee. Would the right hon. Gentleman, before the Debate relating to the allocation of this money comes on again, inquire as to the constitution of that Committee; how many gentlemen are on it, or on the subsidiary body from whom the telegram came?

MR. JACKSON: I shall be happy to inquire if the hon. Member wishes, but I have given the House all the information in my possession in regard to this matter. I read the telegram, as I thought it my duty to do, and I presume the teachers intend to express their views on the subject.

#### THE SALE OF FROZEN MEAT.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the expediency of applying the principle of the Merchandise Marks Act to the sale of frozen meat?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I understand the principle of the Merchandise Marks Act to be that an article must not be so marked as to lead to the belief that it comes from one country when, in reality, it comes from another. I do not at present see how this principle could be applied to frozen meat, which, so far as I am aware, is not marked at all. The matter seems rather to come under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, and I have no information which shows that the provisions of that Act are insufficient to prevent fraud with regard to it.

*Mr. Jackson*

#### THE FINANCIAL RELATIONS OF ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND.

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Committee to inquire into the financial relations of England, Ireland, and Scotland will be appointed?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer will put down a Motion for a Committee on Monday.

#### THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INDIA.

MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury why the Under Secretary for India is not in his place? Several questions of importance with regard to India have been put, but the hon. Member was not in his place to answer them. Why is the hon. Member away? He is the responsible servant of the House in connection with the administration of Indian affairs, and yet he is absent when several most important questions are put.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

#### SIGNALLING INSTRUCTION.

MR. OCTAVIUS V. MORGAN (Battersea): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he intends to hold a class for instruction in signalling for the auxiliary forces at Wellington Barracks this month; whether he is aware that the majority of the officers and non-commissioned officers in those forces that presented themselves for examination last December, after a long and arduous course of instruction, passed the practical examination, but have not yet received their certificates, which has caused great dissatisfaction; and whether there would be any objection to the signalling officer for the time being in the Home District holding the examination in the future both in practical and paper work?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Yes, Sir; a signalling class will be held this month at Wellington Barracks, commencing on the 7th inst. The delay in the issue of certificates to the officers and non-commissioned officers who passed in December last has been caused by the destruction of the whole of the certificate forms in stock by fire. A supply

been ordered from the Stationery office, and the certificates will shortly be issued. It is not considered desirable that the signalling officer in the same District should conduct the examination, as it would lead to a lack of uniformity with other districts.

#### E EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a question of which I have been given notice—whether he can now say definitely if he will bring in a Bill dealing, in a separate Government measure, with the 1st and 2nd clauses of the Bill under consideration last night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot answer the question of the hon. Member without notice.

### MOTIONS.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

##### MORNING SITTINGS.

4.55.) THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) in rising to move—

That the House do meet on Tuesday and day at Two o'clock. That the principal business at such Morning Sittings shall be financial Business and proceedings on the reduction and First Readings of Bills; and that the provisions of Standing Order 56 be extended to such Sittings."

MR. CLANCY: I do not think it will be necessary to recommend the first Resolution which I have to move, except in a few words, for the necessity under which we are for increasing the amount of time available for passing Votes in Supply must, I think, be evident to anyone who knows the statutory obligation under which we are to deal with the Supplementary and other Estimates before the end of the financial year, and who will consult the almanac as to the number of Government days available before that date. Monday, 21st March, is, I believe, the last day upon which the Appropriation Act can be introduced, and before 21st March there are only four Government nights, as things stand at present, on which Supply can

be taken—next Monday and Thursday, and Monday and Thursday in the week following. In those four days we have to deal, in the first place, with Supplementary Estimates. Supplementary Estimates are in this condition—there are 26 Votes in all, and of these 26 Votes, eight, I think, and eight only, have been passed. It is, therefore, evident that by far the larger number remain to be dealt with; nor are those that remain, so far as I can make out, of a non-controversial character. We have the Local Taxation Relief (Scotland) Bill. I should have thought that after the very full discussion of this question the other night, we might perhaps be spared a very long discussion. But rumours have reached my ear that certain Scotch Members desire to express their opinion upon that question. Some time must be occupied before the House can conclude with the Supplementary Estimates; but in addition to the Supplementary Estimates there are the Army and Navy Votes to be got through. The first Army Vote and the first Navy Vote have to be got through with, and we also require to take a Vote on Account. I think, therefore, it is perfectly clear, from a very simple arithmetical calculation, that Her Majesty's Government, if they gave all the time that would be at their disposal if the Standing Orders were left unaltered—it would be quite impossible for us, before the 21st of March, to have dealt with all the financial business, by which is meant Votes in Committee of Supply, the Report of Supply, the Appropriation Bill, and other matters of that kind. The House will notice that, in addition to the financial business, reference is made to the introduction and First Readings of Bills. The House knows that already the Government have begun, so to speak, more than one important measure. The passion for discussing measures before they are seen appears to be growing in certain portions of the House; and though I am far, on this occasion, from desiring to raise any question of debate, the fact at all events will be admitted that it is highly inconvenient, both in the point of view of Members of the House who are anxious to acquaint themselves with the real provisions contained in



Government measures, and also inconvenient to the outside public, who are anxious to know what the proposals are, that these Bills should be suspended, that they should not be before Members and before the country, and that we should therefore be deprived of such advantage as may result, at later stages of the Bills, of hearing the criticisms passed upon them. There is a Bill dealing with the Scotch Local Fee Grant. My right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has a Bill for providing Assisted Education and other purposes in Ireland; and there is a Bill which I endeavoured to introduce on a previous occasion with regard to Private Bill Legislation in Scotland and Ireland. I think it is in the highest degree desirable that these Bills should be before the country. They cannot be before the country unless the House consents to extend the time at our disposal, and therefore I think it will be admitted on all sides that it is not merely for the convenience of the Government, but for the convenience of all parties, that the full particulars of these measures should be printed and circulated as soon as possible. I do not know that it is necessary to add anything to what I have already said in support of this Resolution. It appears to me that when we compare our position on the 3rd of March this year with what it was on the 3rd of March last year the necessity will become very obvious. On the 3rd of March last year the Irish Land Purchase Bill and another important Bill dealing with the Land Commission in Ireland had been read a second time, and the Tithes Bill read a third time.

An hon. MEMBER: Before Christmas.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not raise any complaint against the House. I do not say that the Government think themselves ill-used by the House because our business is not so far advanced; but I only point to the matter of fact that it is not so far advanced, and that, therefore, some measure of this kind is necessary. I hope the House will give us the modest powers we ask without any very prolonged debate.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the House do meet on Thursday and Friday at Two o'clock. That the principal business at such Morning Sittings shall be Financial Business and proceedings on the Introduction and First Readings of Bills; and that the provisions of Standing Order 56 be extended to such sittings."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

(5.7.) MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Midlothian): Mr. Speaker: Sir, I would observe that the right hon. Gentleman has built up a very wide proposal upon an extremely narrow basis. For this is, as I think the House will admit, a very wide proposal. It is a proposal made on the 3rd of March, Parliament having only met on the 9th of February; it is a proposal now to give away the whole of the Tuesdays and Fridays for the entire Session of Parliament.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: So far as Morning Sittings are concerned.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: Exactly so; so far as Morning Sittings are concerned. I think that is a very wide and large proposal to be made on the 3rd of March. It was made on the 16th of March last year, and made on the 16th of March with the observation made by the late Leader of the House that the 16th of March did not mean last year the same as it would have meant in ordinary years, because the Parliament had met, so as to advance the Business of the Session, five weeks earlier—by meeting before Christmas—five weeks earlier than it usually meets, and because he hoped, to use his own language, "to have the time for proroguing the House many weeks before the usual time—in fact, in July." But I need hardly remind the House that that benevolent anticipation was not realised. Now, the right hon. Gentleman having made this broad proposition—for it is a very broad proposition, and it means in fact, with an exception of a very insignificant degree, the giving up of the Tuesdays and Fridays altogether, from the beginning of the year to the close, which I think justifies me in calling it a broad proposition—he has confined the proof of the necessity almost entirely to matters connected with the Appropriation Bill of the present year, which, as he said himself in the course of his argument, runs until the 23rd of March

and then entirely lapses. I will not cavil upon small points. The right hon. Gentleman also referred very properly to the introduction of Bills and their First Reading; and it may be right—and is right—that the Government should have every facility for placing its measures before the country. And, moreover, I will make a further concession, which the right hon. Gentleman might have asked for in the argument of his speech, but did not ask. I think it is desirable that some progress should be made on the Miscellaneous Estimates for the year, before Easter; and, therefore, it is not that I am disposed to quarrel with the right hon. Gentleman so far as regards a moderate and limited proposition. If he were content to limit his Motion until the time of Easter in the circumstances which he stated I should say that a fair case, upon equitable grounds, existed for agreeing to it. But what I wish to point out is this—I am not giving an absolute opinion upon it; but I am, I think, justified in the circumstance that the question of the surrender of the Tuesdays and Fridays, so far as Morning Sittings are concerned, from the beginning of the Session practically to the end, is a very large and serious question; and I would not say that the Government may not be justified in raising that question—possibly it may be so. There is great inconvenience in the very prolonged Sittings of this House, and it is extremely desirable to adopt some measure for getting more forward in Supply in the early and middle part of the year than the right hon. Gentleman has been enabled to do; and, therefore, I do not want to give a deliberate consideration to a question of that kind, if it has been already considered; but it is a very serious question, and it is quite evident that the speech which we have just heard from the right hon. Gentleman, which refers only to the space of a very few days or weeks, does not lay down sufficient to warrant a proceeding which, if adopted by the House, would form an absolute precedent for years for the entire abandonment of a large portion of Tuesdays and Fridays now enjoyed by private Members. Well, Sir, I wish to make two by-observations—one is that the Motion

of my hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen, relating to open spaces in Scotland, stands, I believe, for to-morrow night, and it is probable that he would be the first victim offered up in order to meet the rather voracious appetites and demands of the Government; but my hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce) has had the honour, or infelicity, of being made a victim on former occasions, and has become rather distinguished or conspicuous in that character. I will not then say that this observation is a sufficient reason of itself, but a reason of itself, why no concession should be made to the Government in this matter; but I think it may fairly be asked that if this Motion, or any portion of this Motion, should be passed, the Government will do what they can to expedite matters, so that this Debate may be closed to-morrow evening. I rather think that a fair demand which the House will concede. Then I wish to comment a little upon the phraseology which has been used. First of all, I do not feel entirely comfortable to have the phrase "principal business" in this connection. I know it is not absolutely new. It has been invented, I know, by the present Government. Very many on that side of the House regard it, no doubt, with respect. The critical faculty need hardly be so entirely silent on this side of the House, and, taken in the connection in which it here stands, it will be found not very easy to interpret. However, the right hon. Gentleman is so confident in the applicability of this phrase as a sound phrase of formal Parliamentary interpretation—I know very well as regards the conversational interpretation it is not difficult to interpret it—that for my part I shall be satisfied to leave him responsible for any public detriment that may thereby accrue. But with regard to another phrase I confess I am disposed to press a little further, and that is the phrase "financial business," because that is unquestionably a wide and large phrase. Take, for example, the excessively important measure that was introduced some years ago by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the reduction of the National Debt. That was

financial business undoubtedly; and, at the same time, I think, if we are to maintain the distinction between Morning Sittings and Evening Sittings—if we hold that there are certain subjects of primary importance that ought not to be taken at Morning Sittings—such a Bill as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought not to be introduced in a Morning Sitting. Or take another, the Budget for the year. Certainly I think that is financial business, and on no occasion has the Budget been introduced at such an hour of the day; and so long as the distinction is maintained I think we ought not to regard the Budget as one of the subjects that should be taken in a Morning Sitting. With regard to the Army and Navy Estimates, I believe, by fixed usage, they are retained for the Evening Sittings. I mean to say the first portion—the introduction to the main subjects. Therefore I doubt very much whether the phrase “financial business” is a safe phrase to adopt in the present Motion. At the same time it is not for me to undertake to dictate or advise the Government as to the particular phraseology they propose to adopt. But I hope the House will be able to adopt some expression other than this, which I have a little endeavoured to canvass. But I must confess that, coming to the substance of the subject-matter, I do say that this question is an extremely important question, and a very broad proposition if it is to be interpreted in the sense I have attached to it—namely, to give up from the beginning to the end of the Session, Morning Sittings on Tuesdays and Fridays, the time that private Members now enjoy. As it is a matter of very great importance, I think we ought to understand that if a proposition of this kind is made—for purposes which may or may not be adequate—we are making a very large and permanent alteration in the division of the time of the House between the Government and independent Members. That is not a matter that ought to pass lightly, without notice, or without a notice much more extended than is usually given to propositions of this kind, because this would really come to mean a distinct change of system in the House. What I have to say is this: that although the

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

absolute needs of the Government only extend to the 21st of March, yet, viewing the desirability of the introduction of Bills, and the convenience of making an advance with the miscellaneous Estimates of the year, which we are all disposed, I think, to give a more forward place than they have lately enjoyed, so far as the time at our disposal is concerned, I should be quite ready to agree to a Motion of this kind. Beyond that I could not really, for one, consent to go. I do not wish to do anything inconvenient in form, but in case the Government wish to introduce any change of language into the Resolution, I should be disposed before sitting down to propose to insert the words “until Easter” in the early part of the Motion—that is to say, “That the House do meet on Tuesday and Friday at 2 o'clock until Easter, &c.” I hope this will meet with acceptance by the Government. My contention is simply this: that a permanent change in the allocation of time between the Government and the independent portion of the House is a question of great importance which ought to be largely considered with full notice to all concerned, and ought not to be disposed of as if it were a matter merely formal and subsidiary.

Amendment made, by inserting after the first word “That,” the words “until Easter.”—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps it would be convenient for the House if I at once stated that I am quite ready to adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, provided it is understood that, should the course of Business require it, I am to be at liberty to make any other provision for the dispatch of Business which the necessities of the day may dictate. With regard to the other point raised by the right hon. Gentleman, as to the interpretation of the somewhat novel phrase “financial business,” perhaps it may be convenient for the House if I were to ask you, Sir, what interpretation should be put upon the phrase “financial business,” before it is adopted?

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is rather a matter for the House itself. But looking at the words which are used, I should say they included Supply, the Report of Supply, and the Ways and Means Bill; and

unless a limitation "until Easter" is introduced into the proposition, it will, of course, apply to the Budget. That would be the natural interpretation I should be disposed to put upon it; but it is a matter for the House, and I am not the arbiter of the question.

(5.21.) **SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT** (Derby): My recollection is that the phrase used on former occasions was, "Bills that had their origin in Committee of Supply," or some such phrase.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: And the Scotch Bill.

**SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT**: I do not mean this Session. Formerly there have been Resolutions to that effect which defined Financial Bills as Bills which had their origin in Committee of Supply, and would include Committee of Supply, Ways and Means, and Bills of that description.

(5.22.) **MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton): I confess I always look with a certain amount of doubt and suspicion upon any arrangement, whether public or private, in regard to the Business of this House come to between the two Front Benches, because we always find that there is a tendency on the part of all whom I may term official Members, to squeeze out us poor unfortunate, independent Members on this side of the House. But I confess that as I listened to what fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, I should think there was a considerable amount of reason in what he said in giving this facility till Easter. But I must point out that the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be surprised at the action of the Government. I think the right hon. Gentleman will be more surprised when I tell him and explain to him what has been the action of the Government before and during the Session; for it seems to me that the Government, almost by design, are using all their powers to put off legislation on their own Bills. What happened on the Address? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has frequently had occasion to move the Address on the Queen's Speech. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman ever urged discussion on these occasions.

In fact, I remember that the right hon. Gentleman, and indeed every other Gentleman who held the position of Leader of the House, always somewhat deprecated discussion on that occasion. Well, the right hon. Gentleman will be surprised to hear that the First Lord of the Treasury protested against our not discussing the whole question of Egypt; and then, as if that was not sufficient, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, the Gentleman who is one of the dual control in this House, also deprecated it. I felt very much inclined to accept the challenge.

**MR. A. J. BALFOUR**: I never referred to the question of Egypt at all. But I must say that I felt the greatest satisfaction, and even the greatest surprise, that it was not discussed.

**MR. LABOUCHERE**: When an Irishman trails his coat in a fair he does not ask anyone to tread on it, but he feels surprised if no one does so. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) went even further. He expressed surprise that Members sitting upon that Bench with him and divided in opinions from him did not bring forward a species of counter Address to Her Majesty, stating all they contemplated doing if they got a majority at the next General Election with regard to Ireland. We on this side of the House deprecated these attempts to stave off Public Business, and thanks to our reticence and to the great sorrow of Her Majesty's Government we did not pause a very long time on the Debate on the Address. Then the right hon. Gentleman introduced a Bill he called the Local Government (Ireland) Bill. He introduced it in a sort of way that he did not approve of the Bill himself; that it was a sort of Liberal Unionist Bill; that he was obliged to bring it in, and made a lengthened speech; but certainly it was not a speech that I think would be likely to conduce to the passing of that Bill, or lead anyone to suppose that the right hon. Gentleman intended to persevere with his Bill. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian will be still more surprised to hear that the Leader of the House allowed a Bill to be

introduced in regard to Scotland, that after four or five hours had been spent in discussion upon this Bill the Leader of the House got up and explained that a mistake had been made, that there was no right to bring in the Bill until assent had been given in Committee, and, therefore, the whole proceeding would have to be commenced from the beginning. I wish to point out this, therefore, that if there is any difficulty in regard to Public Business, it may be that the House will endeavour to help the right hon. Gentleman out of his difficulties, but they have all occurred owing to the right hon. Gentleman, and his difficulties would have been much greater if we had accepted his challenge and the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham on the Address. Now, I will tell the right hon. Gentleman why he gets into difficulties, and what feeling a great many Gentlemen have in regard to this matter. We want to know when the Session is going to end. We know perfectly well that this Parliament has attained its majority; we know that it cannot last very long—"No, no"—and we rather suspect that all these endeavours to provoke us into discussion is an attempt to drag matters on until either the hay harvest or the corn harvest, because the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends opposite do not seem to have that confidence in the agricultural labourer that we have. They want to seize the opportunity when this man to whom they have given a vote—to whom a vote has been given, I should rather say—will not be able to exercise his privilege. If the right hon. Gentleman will get up and say, "We recognise fully that it is at least doubtful whether we continue to enjoy the confidence of the country; we think that it is our duty under these circumstances, and owing to the fact of this Parliament having lasted very long"—and in my opinion it has lasted a great deal too long—"we think it is our duty to seize the earliest opportunity when the greatest number of the electors will be on the register in order to consult the country whether they have confidence in us or not." If the right hon. Gentleman would get up and say, "I have had my little joke about this Local

Government Bill. I had not the slightest notion of bringing it in. I should rather not have been forced into bringing it in by the right hon. Gentleman opposite" (Mr. J. Chamberlain). If the right hon. Gentleman were to assure the House, as soon as these Bills he referred to are introduced, and as soon as the Supplementary Estimates and the Vote on Account are carried, he would go to the country, I can assure him that he will receive every facility on the part of Members sitting on this side of the House to expedite Public Business. We do not want to say offensive things to the right hon. Gentleman, but we think he and his Friends have thoroughly outstayed their welcome. As for the Business of this House, why, if the right hon. Gentleman were really to propose that the House should not meet at all, or should only meet once a week, I believe it would be for the benefit of the country. Why should we have all this legislation which is proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, without the right hon. Gentleman knowing whether he has the people of the country at his back? I hold any sort of legislation that takes place by a majority, which was brought together six years ago, to be contrary to the first principles of representative Government, and all the more that when the electors do get an opportunity they will seize it to try and convince the right hon. Gentleman that he and his Government have lost their confidence. Notwithstanding my distrust of the two Front Benches, if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian insists upon his Amendment with regard to Easter, we will not fight or quarrel about it. I should have thought the 30th March would have been preferable, but we certainly will contest to the last the monstrous proposal of the right hon. Gentleman to take Tuesdays and Fridays till the end of the Session. Such a proposal has never been made before, and will I trust be always resisted.

\*(5.33.) MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I wish to ask whether, in the event of the Motion being altered in the manner suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian, the First Lord of the Treasury will agree to give precedence to those

*Mr. Labouchere*

otions on the Paper for Tuesdays and ridays after the Easter Recess? In gard to next Tuesday, some of us find rselves in a position of extreme difficulty, although we are anxious to pedite the Business of the House. n Tuesday next there are four or five lotions down, two of them of importance. One has relation to Scotch sheries, which several Members, representing Scotch constituencies, are nxious to discuss, and the other has reference to the larger question of arbitration with the United States of America.

have heard it stated that that is a uestion upon which you cannot very ell get up the steam, but the steam as already been got up out of doors to considerable extent, and by Tuesday ext, if the Motion is discussed, there ill be petitions representing nearly ,300,000 of our countrymen, heartily ndorsing the proposal for a Treaty f Arbitration. These petitions are igned, irrespective of Party politics, nd in the face of this extraordinary xpression of opinion, mainly from the ndustrial classes, I hope the Government will afford an opportunity of discussing so exceedingly important a uestion. If the right hon. Gentleman ill give a guarantee that the Motions ow standing on the Paper should have precedence after Easter, no difficulty whatever will be felt in passing this Resolution.

MR. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.): I wish, Sir, to endorse what has been stated by my hon. Friend. It is very hard that the time of private Members should be taken in this ruthless manner, and I think we should not be doing our duty if we did not express our strong opinion as to the bungle into which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has got the House over the Estimates. Our position does not arise from the Members of the House, but from the Members of the Government not making proper arrangements to get through the necessary Business before the close of the financial year. I hope the Government will make an exception in favour of the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Jaggerston, which stands for next Tuesday. The industrial classes are

looking forward to a discussion on that Motion with great and deepening interest.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I rise to call attention to one important point, namely, the Motion standing in the name of my hon. Friend the Member for Kerry for Friday the 28th of March, affirming the necessity of the compulsory sale of land to occupying tenants in Ireland. This question, always important, has become urgent since the failure of the Land Purchase Act last year. If this Motion be carried without exception, my hon. Friend will be confined within three hours for the discussion of a question of the greatest magnitude, instead of being allowed seven hours. The interest in Ireland on this question is such that we cannot consent to abandon our rights, and I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he would do well to agree to let us have this particular day out of the considerable number of Tuesdays and Fridays intervening between this and Easter. By the 29th March the Appropriation Bill will have left this House. The only matters remaining will be the introduction of Bills, and I do not think he seriously suggests that the introduction of Bills will be then proceeding. I would, therefore, urge that as it will not be necessary, either for the purpose of financial Business or for the introduction of Bills, for him to take the 29th March, he should allow us to have that day. In order to regularise the proceeding I beg to move, after the word "Friday," to insert these words "except Tuesday, 29th March."

MR. SPEAKER: There is already a Motion before the House to restrict the operation of this Resolution until Easter, and that Resolution I will put from the Chair.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. SEXTON: Then, Sir, I will propose that after the word "Friday," in the second line, the words "except Tuesday the 29th March" be inserted.

Amendment proposed. after the word "Friday," to insert the words "except on Tuesday, the 29th March."—(Mr. Sexton.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman who moved this Amendment will feel it is one the Government can hardly accept. The two hon. Gentlemen who preceded him each made eloquent appeals in favour of Motions standing in their names, and if the Government make an exception in favour of one Member they cannot avoid extending the same Parliamentary privilege to others. The hon. Gentleman has told us that the Motion standing for the 29th March in the name of the hon. Member for Kerry is a very important Motion. I admit that; but the hon. Gentleman is aware that this question has been brought before us frequently last Session as well as this, and is not new to the House. Therefore, although I fully admit the importance of the proposition the hon. Gentleman asks us to accept, I do not think it would be possible to make in favour of that Motion any special claim that would not equally apply to Motions standing in the name of other Gentlemen. I hope the hon. Gentleman will be content with the protest he has made, and will not divide the House on his Amendment.

DR. CLARK (Caithness): I think the better plan would be to strike out the word "Tuesdays," and to give the whole of Fridays to the Government, and I also think that the reference to Standing Order 26 should be struck out. The result would be to give us six hours on Tuesday evenings, which would be better than the risk of three hours on Tuesdays and Fridays. It would certainly give private Members some little time for the discussion of questions in which they are interested. The Government Motion practically means that for the remainder of the Session they will take Tuesdays and Fridays to themselves, and I do not think the three hours they propose to give us each night are worth having. I would rather give them the whole time on Friday.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): This Motion is brought forward at an unusually early period of the Session; it shows the extreme inconvenience of the way in which Business is being done in

this House. We have been told over and over again that Irish and Scotch Business blocks the way, but here we are, without violently contentious Business being introduced, in a position this Session which is worse than ever has been the case before. The reason we ask that the 29th March should be exempted is that a Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Kerry, and relating to the compulsory sale of land in Ireland, should be discussed. Now the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House used this extreme argument. He said that this subject of first-class importance had been brought before the House before. We all know that subjects of great importance are brought forward year after year in this very way, and it is necessary to repeat and enforce these arguments before any result accrues; therefore there is no force in that argument of the right hon. Gentleman. The additional ground for the discussion of the Motion of my hon. Friend is the failure of the Land Purchase Act. It has not worked so rapidly or so smoothly as the Ashbourne Act. If the right hon. Gentleman cannot see his way to exempt the 29th March, I would suggest these alternatives: first, he may promise my hon. Friend the Member for Kerry some day for discussion after Easter; or, if he cannot do that, he might accept the proposition of the Member for Caithness and take Fridays, leaving the Tuesdays open; or, on the other hand, he might at least agree that the discussion of this Motion should be taken on Tuesday 29th March, and allow it to go on until it was fairly exhausted, not enforcing the 12 o'clock Rule. I would earnestly recommend the right hon. Gentleman to take one or other of these courses. Before sitting down, I would call attention to the fact that the hon. Member for South Tyrone is not in his place to assist us on a question in which he professes to be so much interested.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): My hon. Friends are asking for special exceptions for this question relating to Ireland. I think we may fairly claim that the equality of which they speak should extend to Members of this House generally. I do not

think any fair survey of what has already taken place this Session would lead to any other conclusion than that the course of affairs has tended very much in favour of the discussion of Irish questions, which have shut up, to a large extent, the discussion of English questions. We have discussed many Irish subjects—the Belfast lunatics among them. For questions connected with Ireland they have had in discussion their full share, and therefore I contend that we should have more time rather than the Irish Members who have already occupied much time. As to the Amendment, the specific reason why I understand my hon. Friend to desire this exception is to discuss that grand failure of last Session, the Land Purchase Bill, which confiscated a large sum of British money for the purpose of buying out the Irish landlords. We were afraid that the sop would work well among the tenants, and that our money would be spent very freely, but we are thankful to observe that that is not the case. We do not want our money spent in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is discussing the merits of a particular Bill, and not the appropriation of a particular day.

MR. CONYBEARE: I apologise to you, Sir, but I was mentioning that as a reason for disagreeing with my hon. Friends. I hope it may be possible to get rid of the necessity for a Division. If the Government will come forward and say, "We have done our work; we have outlived our time, and we are perfectly ready to go to the country as soon as possible," I am sure that not one of us would make any further objection to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

(6.3.) MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (Londonderry): I would invite the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the suggestions made by my hon. Friends. Every one of these suggestions was fair, and the right hon. Gentleman might surely see his way to adopt at least one of them. We Irish Members are not responsible for any delay or muddling of the Business of this Session. The Business has been delayed and muddled by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House bringing for-

ward measures for Ireland which nobody in Ireland asked him for, and which, so far as I know, nobody in Ireland wants. Who in Ireland asks for such a measure of Local Self-Government as he has brought in, and who in Ireland is going to accept such a measure? We want to have nothing to do with it. Therefore, we are not responsible for the time of the House being taken up with measures which nobody wants, and nobody expects will be for the good of Ireland.

\*(6.5.) MR. LEA (Londonderry, S.): I am sure the hon. Member for East Mayo has no wish to be unfair to my hon. Friend the Member for South Tyrone in saying that he has gone away and left them in the lurch when he knew this question was coming on. My hon. Friend left London last night without having the slightest idea that the matter would be brought forward to-day, and the least he could have done before hastily condemning my hon. Friend would have been to give him the necessary notice. I agree with hon. Members that nothing would be more unsatisfactory than to have an incomplete discussion upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Kerry. I have a good deal of sympathy with that Resolution, and should be extremely glad if the Government could give way.

(6.8.) MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.): The House has been sitting for three weeks and has been counted out three times. I have seen the Government take their Whips—

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order! That has no reference to the Amendment before the House.

MR. BLANE: Where is the necessity for taking our time up to the 29th of March?

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order!

MR. BLANE: The Government have made out no case for taking all the time up to the 29th March.

MR. SPEAKER: The remarks of the hon. Member are not relevant.

(6.10.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no right again to address the House, but it would be only courteous if I said a word about the suggestions that have been made by hon. Members below the Gangway. The proposal of the hon. Member for West Belfast to except Tuesday, the 29th of March,



from the Motion, and the other proposal that the Twelve o'clock Rule should be suspended in favour of a particular Member, are both open to a fatal objection. If the exception is made in the case of one private Member, it is quite impossible to refuse it in the case of others. I have admitted the importance of the Motion which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Kerry, but that must not be taken as an expression of opinion on my part that the Motions of other hon. Members are not worthy of as full and as long a discussion as the Motion of the hon. Member for Kerry. It would not be possible for the Government to make an exception to the 29th of March unless they were prepared to make the same exception for every other Tuesday before Easter.

(6.12.) MR. A. O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): The subject-matter of the Motion which my hon. Friend has given notice of for the 29th is one which will always be with the House while the Land Question in Ireland remains unsettled. I do not know how many weeks it has taken this House to pass the Land Purchase Act. Millions of money were placed at the disposal of the Purchase Commissioners to carry it out. Is all that to be allowed to run waste? Is all that time to be lost? The Purchase Act now is like a water-logged ship—it is useless; it has not been put in operation; and the Government themselves must see the desirability of arriving at some decision as to how it may be made workable. The discussion of a Motion like that of my hon. Friend the Member for Kerry would go, perhaps, some way towards enabling the Government to come to a decision as to how the difficulty may be met. If the Government agreed to the proposal of the hon. Member for West Belfast, they might find in the end that they would be expediting their own Business. The refusal of so moderate a request was not at all likely to cause this side of the House to be very friendly when appeals were made to them by the Government. I have often been struck with the callousness with which representations to the Government from these Benches have been met by Ministers as compared

with the whining tone of appeal which Ministers are accustomed to adopt when in moments of difficulty they find themselves pressed for time, and embarrassed by the Business before the House.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes 129 ; Noes 244.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

Main Question, as amended, again proposed.

(6.40.) MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I think I may now press the First Lord of the Treasury, as the Government is going to take two days practically for Government Business, as to whether he can see his way to make some arrangement by which a very important question—the proposed Gresham University—may have time for discussion. This question is one that concerns a large number of people in London, and to begin to discuss it at 11 o'clock, or even later, would be a very serious drawback. Of course, under the Standing Orders, Debate can go on till any hour in the morning; but as a rule the House will not attend to a discussion after 1 o'clock—in fact the next Resolution shows that they do not care to discuss anything after 12 o'clock.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I feel fully justified, from the facts I have stated, in moving that Tuesday, the 8th of March, be exempted from the operation of the Rule.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman has already spoken on the Main Question.

MR. CREMER: I understood that I should be able to move this Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: No; the hon. Member is precluded from so doing by having already spoken on the Main Question.

MR. PICTON (Leicester): I should like to support the appeal of the hon. Member for Islington. The right hon. Gentleman often endeavours to conciliate the House. I think he should sometimes endeavour to conciliate the country as well. He knows from the importance and influential character of the deputation which waited on the Prime Minister to-day on this subject

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

that the interest in this question is not confined to any one section of the House or to one school of politics. It is a non-political, non-party, and, I hope, non-sectarian question as well. There is a large portion of society interested in the progress of higher education who are alarmed lest a retrograde step should be taken in this matter. The crucial issue is now before us, and to say it is to be discussed by a weary House after 11 o'clock at night till 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning is really to make a mockery of it, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will reconsider his position and accede to the appeal made to him from his own Party.

MR. ROBY (Lancashire, S.E., Eccles): I rise to suggest one way in which this difficulty can be met. If the right hon. Gentleman will give us an assurance that the Charter shall not be submitted to Her Majesty until a satisfactory opportunity has been given to the House of discussing it, that will probably meet the views of hon. Members.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite in accord with hon. Members who have spoken in thinking that the Government ought not to compel the House of Commons to discuss a question in which a large number of Members feel a very keen interest, under conditions which would render a fair discussion impossible. Of course, there might be a difference of opinion among hon. Members as to what constitutes fair discussion. But, at all events, I will say—though I cannot promise, cannot give a pledge to my hon. Friends that I will ask the House to adjourn Supply before 11 o'clock—I will not ask the House to sit till abnormal hours in the morning for the purpose of discussing the matter, nor would I endeavour to bring the Debate prematurely to a close if it were clearly the desire of the House to prolong it. Probably the discussion would be exhausted between 11 and 1, but if it were necessary that the Debate should be adjourned, I would consent to the Adjournment.

MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will not the Debate terminate at 12 o'clock under the Standing Orders of the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman is not aware that these Charters laid on the Table of the House do not come under the Twelve O'clock Rule, and, therefore, I think the general pledge I have given to the House will gratify both my hon. Friends and hon. Gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman give two or three days' notice before the Indian Councils Bill is brought on?

MR. J. LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Perhaps my right hon. Friend might be open to some compromise on this subject, which appears to be a subject of considerable interest, and obviously a hurried discussion in the small hours of the morning would hardly meet the requirements of the case. Can my right hon. Friend hold out any hope of this Motion being taken at 10 o'clock; it might then be disposed of by 12.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Between 10 and 12 is practically the same as between 11 and 1.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 282; Noes 60.—(Div. List, No. 18.)

Resolved, That until Easter the House do meet on Tuesday and Friday at Two o'clock. That the principal business at such Morning Sittings shall be Financial Business and proceedings on the Introduction and First Readings of Bills; and that the provisions of Standing Order 56 be extended to such Sittings.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

(SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move the second Motion which stands in my name, and only preface it with this remark—that I gather from what has been said that in putting the Motion down on the Paper I am only carrying out the wish of hon. Gentlemen in all parts of the House. It is not done so much—indeed, not at all—in the interests of the Government Business as to meet the convenience of the Members and of the officers of the House. The only difference between the Motion I have on the Paper and the Motion of last year is that the present Motion will make the Resolution a Standing Order,

while the Resolution of last year was only a Sessional Order. I am inclined to think that the result of the experiment made last year is to create the conviction that the general convenience is best consulted by not continuing Debate until 1 o'clock, and hon. Members will perhaps agree that the modification made in the Rules last year should become part of the Standing Orders of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the sitting of the House at Nine o'clock be held subject to the provisions of Standing Order No. 1, which relate to the interruption of Business and the Adjournment of the House; that this Resolution be a Standing Order of the House; that Standing Order No. 8 be repealed."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

DR. CLARK (Caithness): If you make it a Standing Order that the debate must terminate at 12 o'clock, a question can only have three hours' discussion. Private Members will only get three hours a night or six hours a week under the present form of the Resolution.

MR. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.): I am very pleased to find that the Twelve o'clock Rule is to be adhered to on Tuesdays and Fridays. It is a great convenience to many hon. Members that contentious Business should not come on after 12 o'clock, as that enables them to catch their trains or other conveyances.

SIR G. TREVELYAN (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I gather that the House is of the same mind as it was last year, and therefore I shall not say any word in support of the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, and still less in opposition to it, as I had the honour, last year, of acting with the Leader of the House in getting the change adopted for last Session. But I must say that there were two conditions attached by the House and accepted by the Leader of the House. The first was that it should be a Sessional Order; on that point I do not care to insist; but the other is a more important matter. The Government can, under the present Resolution, use Tuesdays and Fridays after the Morning Sittings for advancing Money Bills or Report of Supply. If the Government are willing to give an assurance that they will not use this hour, which

private Members have surrendered, for the Business of Supply, I think the House will be prepared to accept the Resolution, probably without a Division.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought I did give that assurance in answer to a similar question, but I am quite willing to repeat it now.

Motion agreed to.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

#### SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1891-2 (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.)

(In the Committee.)

Considered in Committee.

#### CLASS V.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £22,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."

(7.8.) DR. CLARK (Caithness): I wish to call attention to the sum for the Boundary Commission between the Portuguese and the Chartered Company. I want to know why this money was not paid by the company instead of by the Imperial Government? I understand that those companies by their Charter would have to pay their own costs. These people have many powers; amongst others, the right to tax, and they are putting them on very severely. If that is so, why should this charge be upon the Imperial Exchequer? I should also like to know if the Commission has yet sat?

(7.10.) THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MR. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): The Commission has sat: they met in the autumn of last year, and arrangements were made between the representatives to carry out the necessary preliminaries. Major Levison is at present in this country, but he is about to return almost immediately to the East Coast of Africa, and the matter will be at once proceeded with. I believe the work of delimitation was carried out in consequence of the Anglo-Portuguese Convention, and at the respective cost of the two Governments.

*Mr. A. J. Balfour*

**DR. CLARK :** But why should it not be paid by the Chartered Company? We have not control over it.

**MR. J. W. LOWTHER :** They are only acting as our representatives.

**DR. CLARK :** Another matter to which I would wish to call the attention of the House is the item of £5,600 for outfits in consequence of the deaths of Lord Lytton and Sir William White. I would like to know how much these diplomatic changes cost? I think we should also get details of the Vote. But why should we pay for the removal of the horses and carriages of these gentlemen and pay for the new furniture which they think well to select? When these gentlemen remove from one place to another and some new official takes the place what I ask becomes of the furniture, &c.? We pay these men large salaries, we give them houses, and we spend a great deal of money upon them; why then should we be called upon to pay such charges as these? What becomes of the furniture? Is it sold, or do the butlers take charge of it?

\***MR. J. W. LOWTHER :** I am afraid the hon. Member has got on the wrong line of rails in reference to this matter. Those outfits are granted to Ambassadors, Ministers, Secretaries of Embassy and of Legation upon their going to a new post, and I believe that they only barely cover the expenses. When a Minister has to break up his establishment, these outfit grants cover his travelling and removal expenses: the expense he is put to in having to break up his establishment, the cost of having to settle down in a new position, and various costs incurred in many other ways. The hon. Member has asked for details as to the Vote which is due to the deaths which unfortunately took place in the last year in the ranks of the Diplomatic Service. Lord Dufferin on going to Paris will get £2,000 for outfit. These outfits have been fixed for a great number of years between the Treasury and the Foreign Office. They were inquired into by a Committee that sat some years ago on the Diplomatic Service Votes, and the Committee did not report otherwise than favourably.

Sir Clare Ford will get £1,250; Sir D. Wolff, £2,000; Lord Vivian, £2,500; Sir E. Monson, £650, and Mr. Egerton, £1,100. Last year the whole sum expended in outfits was £1,416, and the year before, although the sum down in the Estimates was £5,000, only £3,700 out of that was spent.

(7.15.) **MR. LABOUCHERE** (Northampton): The hon. Gentleman says that Lord Dufferin received £2,000 to cover his expenses on going from Rome to Paris, and that the money was expended in travelling and for his personal impedimenta. But why this discrepancy in the allowance if they are made for personal expenses? If we take distance into account they seem to follow no intelligible principle, for whilst Lord Dufferin gets £2,000 for going from Rome to Paris, Lord Vivian gets £2,500 for going from Brussels to Rome, while Mr. Egerton gets £1,100 for going from Paris to Greece. Again, Mr. Monson only gets £650, and it is obvious that if he has been properly paid these other gentlemen have been improperly paid, and that they have received too much. We poor people have travelled somewhat on the Continent however, and we know something about the expense of it, and I should be inclined, if it costs these gentlemen so much for travelling expenses, to suggest that the Government should consider the advisability of going to Messrs. Cook. From what the hon. Member has stated it would appear that removal of furniture has nothing to do with the grants, and that this is a species of general allowance made to Ambassadors and Ministers for going from one place to another. Under these circumstances I beg to move the reduction of the Vote by £2,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item N, Outfits, be reduced by the sum of £2,000."—*(Mr. Labouchere.)*

(7.18.) **MR. LEVESON-GOWER** (Stoke-upon-Trent): I do not see upon what principle this money is given to Ambassadors and Ministers, and not extended to the junior members of the Diplomatic Service, who have to move about more frequently than the Ambassadors or Ministers, and who are paid a less salary.

(7.20.) MR. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I wish to ask the hon. Member whether Sir H. D. Wolff will receive an allowance for outfit on going from Bucharest to Madrid?

\*(7.21.) MR. J. W. LOWTHER: With reference to the question asked by my hon. Friend, I have to say that I believe the usual course will be followed, and that on the transfer of Sir H. D. Wolff he would receive an outfit. I do not see anything extraordinary in it that hon. Members should laugh. I did not mean to say that the outfit was meant simply to cover the personal expenses of the Minister; it is also for the travelling expenses of his family, and the expense incurred in moving his own private furniture, and horses and carriages. The Minister's goods and chattels, the position he holds, and a great many other things are matters which the junior members of the Diplomatic Service do not have to deal with, entitle him to a larger sum. Therefore, it is perfectly obvious that the expenses to which an Ambassador or Minister is put in moving from one mission to another are relatively very much greater than those of the junior members. This scheme of outfits was settled upon after communication with the Treasury; it was investigated by a Committee of the House and approved, and the general principle upon which it is founded is about one-third of the salary attached to the post to which Her Majesty's Representatives are appointed.

(7.23.) MR. P. STANHOPE (Wendbury): I wish to ask whether any inquiry was made on the part of the Foreign Office as to the items of expenditure before these gentlemen got to their posts? I understand how it may be desirable to pay the expenses of Ambassadors moving from one place to another; but I think advantage should not be taken of that for granting them a lump sum that is more than what is actually expended. I hope that when further sums are applied for in regard to these outfits the Under Secretary will be able to lay before the House more details, for I think he should show to the House that the money was actually expended.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER: The hon. Gentleman has not answered that part of my question which refers to junior members of the Service. I should think some amount should be paid them, and I should like if the Under Secretary would give us some assurance upon the point.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I can explain how I myself was treated. I was Second Secretary of Legation once, and had to go from London to Constantinople. I put in a statement as to how much it cost me. Now, Mr. Courtney, I am an honest man, and I put in exactly what it cost me in trains; but Mr. Cunningham, who was then at the head of the Financial Department of the Foreign Office, told me that I was to supply vouchers. I told him that if he insisted on vouchers the railway companies might not give them; but it was of no avail, and I had to appeal to Lord Russell, and pledge myself that I had actually expended the money in railway travelling from one point to another. It is evident this amount has nothing to do with the money spent, as the Under Secretary says it is based upon one-third of the salary. I admit that these men have a right to be paid their expenses, but we know that this is absolutely in excess; we know, and it has been admitted, that it does not depend upon the actual amount spent, and therefore I must persist in my Motion.

DR. CLARK: We have been told that this money was for outfit, and from the reply of the hon. Gentleman opposite it would appear that they did not get any outfit. In short, it is not for outfit at all.

(7.24.) DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): It seems to me extraordinary the way in which these items are placed upon the Paper, and that more attention is not paid to details. More information should be given, and I, for one, think the House should ask for it before it votes away this extraordinary large sum without thoroughly understanding it.

(7.25.) MR. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.): I wish to observe that we had no explanation from the Under Secretary as to the way in which the outfit is calculated; he has

simply told us that it is about one third of the salary paid. According to the hon. Member for Northampton, it would appear that there is some doubt about that point. Now, I am also an honest man, and I wish to tell the House that when I was Judge Advocate General, I was called upon to state exactly what I spent, and I endeavoured to act as fairly as I could. There is no reason why the same course should not be taken in this case, and why Ambassadors and Ministers should not do the same.

(7.27.) MR. ROBY (Lancashire, S.E. Eccles): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, what is the date of the Committee to which he referred as having carried out this arrangement?

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: The Committee reported in 1870.

MR. ROBY: Are we to clearly understand that this money will not be used for the purchase of furniture? I confess I feel it would be much more satisfactory if the money were calculated upon some other scale than the amount of salary. This is a rough method of calculation, and not by any means so satisfactory as if the exact amount expended were recorded.

\* (5.28.) MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I think I can explain the discrepancy which the hon. Member for Northampton has discovered. On his first appointment as Ambassador a gentleman receives a full outfit, which is roughly calculated at one-third of the salary attached to the post. If he is only transferred from one Embassy to another then he does not receive a full outfit; I think he then only receives one-half of the outfit. In the same way, if a gentleman proceeds from a Legation to an Embassy, he then receives a full outfit. If he proceeds to a Legation for the first time, he then receives a full outfit; but if from a Legation to a Legation, he only receives half. Such is the explanation of the discrepancy. In the case of Lord Vivian, for instance, he received a full outfit, but Sir Clare Ford did not receive a full outfit. Outfits include furniture, that covers not merely the cost of travelling, but also the cost of moving the family, servants, horses, carriages, and such furniture as the Ambassador

wishes to move from one Mission to another. It is perfectly true that at the Chief Embassies there is a certain quantity of furniture which belongs to these Embassies, but it is of a very meagre character, and very much of the character which Government furniture is apt to be. And therefore the cost of the removal of old and the purchase of new furniture to make the new residence inhabitable is covered by the outfits which are given.

(7.32.) MR. LABOUCHERE: I think the hon. Gentleman has still failed to explain this matter. He says that when a gentleman is promoted from being a Minister to be an Ambassador, he receives one-half of the allowance that he would otherwise receive. The hon. Gentleman has said that Lord Dufferin received £2,000 on removal from Rome, where he had been an Ambassador, to Paris, where he is now an Ambassador; but that Sir Clare Ford had only received £1,200 on being transferred from Madrid, where he had been an Ambassador, to Constantinople, where he is also an Ambassador. But the explanation of the hon. Gentleman, I am bound to say, does not account for these discrepancies.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 103; Noes 152.—(Div. List, No. 19.)

Original Question again proposed.

(7.33.) DR. CLARK: I think we should have some explanation with respect to this item of £3,000 relating to the Government of India.

(7.34.) MR. J. W. LOWTHER: The Government of India have hitherto been paying £10,000 a year towards the Mission to Persia; but lately they have represented to Her Majesty's Government that the Indian Government were paying the cost of the Agencies at Bushire and Meshed, which amounts to £16,000 a year, and they considered that the resources of India should not be taxed to a greater extent than £7,000 instead of £10,000 a year. And seeing that India pays on Agencies, etc., as much as £23,000 a year, and the Imperial Government only paid, roughly speaking, £12,000 a year, it was thought that it was only fair that that sum of £3,000 should be placed upon the Imperial Estimates.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,610, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, for the Expenses of the High Commissioner for South Africa."

(7.35.) DR. CLARK: I should like to have some explanation about this item of £1,000 for telegrams. I do not know of any burning question in South Africa which would cause so much expenditure upon telegrams. Last year there was one, but this year there was no burning question in South Africa, and yet we have the Estimate increased by 50 per cent. when there was no trouble in the country. I should like to get some reply in reference to this matter.

\*(7.36.) SIR JOHN GORST: I am not quite so familiar with this Vote as my right hon. Friend the Under Secretary, but I am informed that the excess is due to the action of certain burghers in the South African Republic, who made a trek into territory in the direction of British Bechuanaland, or rather Matabeleland. This movement threatened to be inimical to British interests, and necessitated this large expenditure upon telegrams; and I say that money has been well spent. Owing to the vigorous intervention of Sir Henry Loch, and to the friendly co-operation of the South African Republic, that movement of the burghers entirely failed.

(7.39.) MR. MAC NEILL (Donegal, S.): I wish to know where is the Under Secretary? I think this is a discourtesy that he should not be here to give us the information we want. We want to know about these telegrams. We are not satisfied with the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman, who, with great candour, says he knows nothing about them. [SIR JOHN GORST: No, no.] Yes, he got a paper from the Colonial Office, took it from his portfolio, and then read it with very great difficulty. That is not the way to do business when we are dealing with public money. I certainly will move a reduction of this Vote in order that it may be deferred

until the Under Secretary for the Colonies is present. If I cannot do so, I shall move a Resolution. Am I in order in moving it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MAC NEILL: Very well. Then I beg to move that the Vote be reduced by £2,000, to show my sense first of this reprehensible manner of spending public money, and, secondly, for the purpose of making the servants of the Crown do their duty instead of doing the work of the First Lord of the Treasury by electioneering in the country. In the late Mr. W. H. Smith's time such a thing would not have occurred. I would ask the First Lord of the Treasury to be good enough to give us some explanation, if he can, why the Under Secretary for the Colonies has not been in his place to-day or for the last week.

\*(7.42.) SIR JOHN GORST: I hope the hon. Member will withdraw his Motion. I am the Minister of the Crown responsible for this Estimate. I gave a reply which has satisfied the hon. Member who asked the question. I did not say I did not know anything about it. I have said all I know about it, and I think I gave what the hon. Member who asked the question considers a full and clear explanation. I hope, therefore, the hon. Member will not persevere with his Motion, as it would be indirectly a Vote of Censure on myself, who, however inadequately, in the absence of the Under Secretary of State, have replied to the question. But if the Under Secretary of State had been in his place he would not have said more than I have said on the subject.

(7.50.) DR. TANNER: The right hon. Gentleman, in a most extraordinary speech, tells us that the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies could not do the work half as well as the right hon. Gentleman himself. [SIR JOHN GORST: No, no.] Accordingly I wish to point out to the House—what we have been trying to impress upon you from these Benches—that a great number of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite fill ornamental places, and that their services can be very easily dispensed with. I never saw a more amusing state of affairs in this Committee of Supply before. I

hope, in view of what has taken place on the present occasion, that, in the first place, responsible Ministers will see their way when they have to come to this House to ask for public money so that they will be able to definitely tell us what are the things on which this money has been expended, without all this huffer-muffer on the Treasury Bench; and, again, I hope this Committee will see, what we have endeavoured frequently to point out, that a great many of these posts filled by Members of Her Majesty's Government and the supporters of Her Majesty's Government could be very easily dispensed with.

(7.57.) MR. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.): There is a certain amount of force in what has been said about the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies being absent; but his place could not be better filled than by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I hope, therefore, the hon. Gentleman will not go to a Division.

(7.58.) MR. MACNEILL: I am not going to persevere with this Motion, and I do not wish to cast any blame upon the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury in any way. At the same time, I think it would have been more courteous if the First Lord were to answer a question asked in reference to an absent Under Minister, and state why the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies is not in his place. When this Vote comes on I wish to know are the Under Secretaries—especially the Under Secretary for the Colonies—appointed for the transaction of Public Business and to act in the public interest, or whether the Under Secretary for the Colonies is receiving a salary of £2,000 a year to stump for the Government out of doors? I wish to know which is his business—is his business to be here on the Treasury Bench to answer me, or is he to be down in the country electioneering?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If I did not answer the question before, it was because I thought an answer had been very amply given by my right hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury. No doubt I am responsible in this House for seeing that the Business of the House is fully, as well as pro-

perly, discharged. No doubt my right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies would have been in his place had there been anything on the Paper to indicate that any question of importance would arise in reference to this Vote.

MR. MAC NEILL: Oh, this is very important.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will allow me to proceed. A small Debate has arisen, not a Debate on the question of policy, and I think it will be admitted that no more able substitute than my right hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury could have been found. It would undoubtedly be a very unfortunate state of things if an important Debate on matters of policy arose in the absence of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, or if the military question were raised in the absence of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War. But neither of these things has occurred, and I hope the hon. Gentleman will not press his point.

DR. CLARK: I am very well satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, though I should like to have an explanation of the appearance of the items of expenditure in February and March last year on this Vote. I should also like an explanation of the item of £160 to a gentleman who has a pension as a post-captain in the Navy as well as his salary as secretary.

\*SIR JOHN GORST: In consequence of this gentleman receiving retired Naval pay, 10 per cent. is deducted from his salary. Sir Graham Bower is a gentleman of very great ability, who has held office for nearly eight years, and his salary is only £500, rising by increments of £20 to £700. We propose to grant him this personal allowance in consideration of his long service and high ability.

MR. MAC NEILL: In the absence of the Under Secretary for the Colonies, I wish to bear testimony to what the right hon. Gentleman said as to the Secretary to the High Commissioner. His duties are great, his work is responsible, his intelligence is conspicuous, and he deserves any recognition that can be given him.

DR. TANNER: It is advisable in the public interest that when gentle-



men draw large sums of money it should be put down in order that we may know the extent of these extraordinary grants. If the whole of these items paid to public servants were placed before the House, the House would be in a better position to judge, and be better able to modify and check extravagance. Again and again we have called attention to the slipshod manner in which these Estimates are presented.

MR. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.): I am not at all satisfied with the excuses that have been given for the absence from the House of the Under Secretary for the Colonies. I think he ought to have been here to attend to any questions on these Estimates. There has been no explanation given. We are told he has left a good substitute. I do not deny that. The Secretary to the Treasury is a substitute, and something more. If it is to be intended as a tribute to the abilities of the Secretary to the Treasury, I think he might—very profitably to this House—be the sole occupant of the Treasury Bench. But that is no answer. The Under Secretary ought to have been here; and if his absence is to be explained away in the manner suggested, why should we not abolish two or three of the number of Under Secretaries who sit on these Benches? It is no use telling us that we have a very versatile and able gentleman representing him. We knew that before; we have known it all along. I see that the Secretary to the Treasury has been re-inforced by the Junior Lord of the Admiralty. He becomes extremely strong with such supplement. I hope my hon. Friends will continue their opposition to this Vote, and I shall support them simply to mark my offended sense of the absence of the Under Secretary for the Colonies. Where is he? What is he doing? I am told he is in the Chertsey Division. Why is he not here to attend to the Estimates? His absence will cause much larger questions. If he can be in the Chertsey Division without detriment to the interests of his office, the office might very profitably be abolished, and we should leave the Secretary to the Treasury to attend to the whole work.

*Dr. Tanner*

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 131; Noes 61.—(Div. List, No. 20.)

Resolutions to be reported.

THE IMPERIAL BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,000 be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, as a Grant in Aid of the Cost of Preliminary Surveys for a Railway from the Coast to Lake Victoria Nyanza."

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: As this Vote appears for the first time in the Estimates, I think the Committee will probably expect some explanations of the reasons which have led the Government to propose it. I can give them in a sentence, if I say that this Vote is submitted to the House in continuation and amplification of the policy which for many years past has actuated Her Majesty's Governments and the country in dealing with the suppression of the Slave Trade in East and in Central Africa. This is not a new policy; it is a policy that has been carried out by successive Governments during a long period of years, not spasmodically, but constantly. It has met with the general support not only of this House, but with the general support of the country. It is, I think I may fairly say, part of the traditional policy of this country. So far as public efforts are concerned, Her Majesty's ships have held the sea on the East Coast of Africa for many years, and have been engaged in suppressing the sea-borne Slave Trade. The Public Purse has supplied funds, to a large extent, to keep these ships on the sea—to keep them coaled and efficient, and that at a time when we had no stations from Aden to Natal, no Protectorates on the East Coast of Africa, and no responsibilities. And whilst the public has not been slow to find means for suppressing the Slave Trade, private exertions have ably seconded public effort. The missionaries sent out by private persons, and especially by the Scotch people, have penetrated into Equatorial Africa charged with the duty of christianising those vast populations, and of exhorting them to put an end to this inhuman

traffic. And I think we may fairly claim that our public and private efforts have been attended with a large measure of success. Some twenty years ago the export of slaves from that sea coast was reckoned at about 20,000 per annum. That export or sea-borne trade in slaves has now almost ceased. At any rate, it has diminished so as to be now a very small quantity. But whilst the export trade has ceased, it is notorious that the home trade still continues. We have scotched the snake, but we have not yet killed it. And I think I may ask permission of the Committee to explain what I mean by the export trade and the home trade in slaves. What happens, as I understand, is this: that in order that goods should be brought to the coast from the central regions of Africa, the slaves are collected and raided, and are used as porters to bring down the goods. When they arrive at the coast the slaves are a marketable article. They can either be exported to the islands lying off the coast of Africa, to Arabia, or elsewhere; or if there is no demand for their export, they can be sold just as cattle or beasts of burden can be sold, or utilised for the return journey to Central Africa. This internal trade in slaves attracted the attention especially of the Government of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, the Member for Midlothian, as early as May, 1885, and I find that on the 25th May, 1885, Lord Granville wrote a very interesting and important Despatch to Sir Edward Malet, in which he said—

"I have to request your Excellency to state that the supposition that Her Majesty's Government have no intention of opposing the German schemes of colonisation in the neighbourhood of Zanzibar is absolutely correct. Her Majesty's Government, on the contrary, view with favour these schemes, the realisation of which will entail the civilisation of large tracts over which hitherto no European influence has been exercised; the co-operation of Germany with Great Britain in the work of the suppression of the slave gangs; and the encouragement of the efforts of the Sultan both in the extinction of the Slave Trade and in the commercial development of his dominions. I should wish your Excellency, while speaking in this sense to the Chancellor, to inform him that a scheme has been started in this country under which, if it is realised, the efforts of German enterprise may be supported indirectly by British enterprise. You will explain that a prominent capitalists have originated a plan for a British settlement in

the country between the coast and the lakes which are the sources of the White Nile, and for its connection with the coast by a railway. In order to obtain fair security for their outlay they propose to endeavour to procure concessions from the Sultan of a comprehensive character. Her Majesty's Government have the scheme under their consideration, but they would not support it unless they were fully satisfied that every precaution was taken to insure that it would in no way conflict with the interests of the territory that has been taken under a German protectorate, nor affect that part of the Sultan's dominions lying between that territory and the sea."

Now, Sir, that shows that as early as May, 1885, Lord Granville and the Government over which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian presided had taken this important matter into their careful consideration. They were aware that it was proposed by a number of gentlemen to develop that portion of Eastern Africa, especially by the method of making a railway which would run from the coast to the Victoria Nyanza, and the only condition apparently, judging from this Despatch which Her Majesty's Government at that time attached to the proposal, was that the sphere of delimitation between the German Government and ourselves should be distinctly laid down. Now, Sir, I would ask permission of the Committee to make a brief review of the events that have occurred since that date. The agreement which Lord Granville had contemplated in 1885 became a fact in 1886. The German Government and our own Government arrived at an agreement as to the line of demarcation between their respective spheres of influence in East Africa, and the line was drawn from the mouth of the River Umba, passing in a north-westerly direction along the northern slopes of the Mount Kilima Njaro, and finally striking Lake Victoria Nyanza at latitude 2° south. In 1888 Her Majesty's present Government granted a Charter to the Imperial British East Africa Company, following the example which had been set them two years before by the Government of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who granted a Charter to the Niger Company for the development of the Niger district of Africa, and following, as to many of its clauses, the clauses of that Charter almost word for word. In the year 1890 the British East Africa Company

pushed into the interior and sent Captain Lugard on a mission to Uganda. In 1890, after he had arrived at Uganda, a further agreement was arrived at between Her Majesty's Government and the German Government, which accepted the line already laid down, confirmed it, and delineated the spheres of influence further west and in other directions. In 1890, Her Majesty's Government also declared a protectorate over Zanzibar, and in 1891 the Sultan of Zanzibar decreed that the Slave Trade in his dominions should be gradually extinguished. I quote those events to show that in 1891 and in 1892 we stand in a very different position from what we did in 1885. We have acquired vast new interests in East Africa, and with these new interests we have also taken upon ourselves new responsibilities. In the meanwhile, in Europe this matter of the internal Slave Trade had attracted considerable attention. Cardinal Lavigerie, in a series of very powerful addresses delivered in Brussels, had arrested the attention of philanthropists to this matter. He proposed that it might be dealt with by the institution of a Volunteer Army and by the absolute prevention of the importation of arms. Those matters were submitted to Her Majesty's Government; and whilst they did not consider that either of those two plans was capable of adoption, or at all events of execution, it was chiefly at the instigation of Her Majesty's Government and the German Government that the Belgian King convoked the Brussels Conference, which led to the signature of the Brussels Act in 1890. Now, I must ask the attention of the Committee for a few moments to the first Article of the Brussels Act. The first Article reads thus:—

"The Powers declare that the most effective means for counteracting the Slave Trade in the interior of Africa are the following:—

1. Progressive organisation of the administrative, judicial, religious, and military services in the African territories, placed under the sovereignty or protectorate of civilized nations.
2. The gradual establishment in the interior, by the responsible power in each territory, of strongly occupied stations in such a way as to make their protective or repressive action effectively felt in the territories devastated by man-hunters.

*Mr. J. W. Lowther*

3. The construction of roads, and in particular of railways connecting the advanced stations with the coast, and permitting easy access to the inland waters and to the upper reaches of streams and rivers which are broken by rapids and cataracts, so as to substitute economical and speedy means of transit for the present means of portage by men.
4. The establishment of steamboats on the inland navigable waters and on the lakes, supported by fortified posts established on the banks.
5. The establishment of telegraphic lines, assuring the communication of the posts and stations with the coast and with the administrative centres.
6. Organisation of expeditions and flying columns to keep up the communication of the stations with each other and with the coast, and to assure the security of the roadways.
7. Restriction of the importation of firearms, at least of modern pattern, and ammunition throughout the entire extent of the territories infected by the Slave Trade."

That is the first and the leading Article of the Brussels Act. It does not appear, so far as I have been able to discover, that there has been much criticism, either in this House or outside this House, of the policy which Her Majesty's Government pursued in putting their signature to that Act. Such as it is, the criticism appears to be of a favourable character. I find that my hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Bryce) last year referred to it in these terms. He said—

"I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir James Fergusson, then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs), and I hope this Convention (the Brussels Act) will be carried through, and the adhesion of the Foreign Powers obtained. I think we must all feel that there is no matter to which the combined action of the Powers ought to be more earnestly addressed than the suppression of the Slave Trade, and I am certain there is no part of the Government's policy which will receive more hearty and more unanimous support."

That being the attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite and of the country, we have, in laying this Vote on the Table, only carried out the principle which, in signing the Brussels Act, we accepted. The Brussels Act emphasises and particularises our policy, and not only our policy, but the policy of Europe in its method of dealing with the Slave Trade. The Brussels Act gives the *imprimatur* of

the assent of Europe to certain methods of dealing with this trade. The countries which have signed this Act have not only put their hand to it, but they have undertaken, by so signing, new responsibilities and new duties. That being so, Her Majesty's Government had to consider in what method the Act is to be carried out, and hon. Gentlemen will observe that two alternatives are suggested. One is the establishment of fortified posts at different parts of Equatorial Africa, and the establishment of flying columns, starting from these fortified posts, to deal with the slave traders as they come down from the centre to the coast. The other is that specially laid down in the third paragraph of the first Article—namely, the construction of roads, and in particular of railways. To the former alternative there are many objections. In the first place, if we fix certain military posts, it is quite possible—nay, it is easy—for slave raiders and slave gangs to avoid these posts. The radius which can be covered from these posts is only of a limited character, and as soon as it is known what the radius is, the slave raiders will get the length of the radius, and they will avoid them. Again, the establishment of military posts is a matter which would involve enormous cost to this country, and further the establishment of posts of a military character would be very likely to tend to the irritation of the populations amongst whom those posts were established. Further, the benefits to be derived from the establishment of such posts would be only of a transitory character, because the probability would be that the moment the military posts were withdrawn the slave raiding would recommence and continue as hitherto. In favour of the latter course—namely, of opening up the country by means of a railway from the coast to Lake Victoria Nyanza—there are certain considerations to be looked at. In the first place it is a peaceful method of dealing with the difficulty. If the railway is a success the benefits of it will be of a lasting and not of a temporary character. The locomotive, in fact, by means of competition, will kill both the caravan and the kidnapper. I think I have already,

at an earlier stage, sufficiently explained how it is that the Slave Trade exists. It meets a natural demand, the demand for portage. The cost of portage to the interior of Africa, to Uganda, and the coasts of the Lake Victoria Nyanza is enormous. I believe it is reckoned about £300 a ton. It is impossible to obtain animals to carry the burdens, because they are killed by the tsetse fly. By means of a railway we should find ourselves able to substitute the locomotive in the place of the caravan and the kidnapper. Whilst, on the one hand, we should open up the interior of the country to our own commerce, on the other hand, by the very competition of the railway, we produce a means which must kill—must effectually kill—any further continuance of the slave traffic, slave raiding, and slave portage. The slave routes lie chiefly from the east side of the Lake Victoria Nyanza down to the coast in the neighbourhood of Mombasa and northward, and also from the north-west of the Lake Victoria Nyanza down the western side of the lake to the southern portion. Now, if a railway is built going from Mombasa to the Lake Victoria Nyanza you tap at once the former of these two localities, and at the same time enabling ourselves, at a comparatively moderate cost, to place steamers upon the Lake Victoria Nyanza—a lake, by the way, which ought rather to be called a sea, because it is in acreage, I believe, as large as Scotland—and these steamers, by trading round the lake and thus killing the slave portage by their competition, would bring the commerce down not only from the district between the lake and the coast, but also from the district immediately round the Lake Victoria Nyanza and to the west and north of it. I do not know that I need refer at any great length to the characteristics of Uganda. Many travellers have explored the country, and we have the record of their travels. Uganda has been called “the pearl of Africa.” It is the only Christian community in Central Africa. The King is a Christian King. It is surrounded by a large Mahomedan population. We have many missionary establishments situated in Uganda. The people of Uganda are described as a fine race of

men ready to work, and in Uganda traces of former civilisation have been discovered, which may possibly again bring forth good fruit if opportunity is offered to open up the country. The question then resolves itself into this: Are we prepared to go on with the traditional policy of this country, or are we prepared to reverse it? Are we content to sign a document like the Brussels Act, which reads very well and for which we obtained considerable credit, and are we not prepared to follow it up? The Governments of other countries have already taken steps in the direction in which Her Majesty's Government now ask the House to proceed. The Government of Belgium contributes no less than £80,000 a-year towards the administration of the Congo State.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The King of the Belgians.

MR. J. W. LOWTHER: Well, the King contributes no less than £80,000. The German Imperial Government have spent large sums in developing that portion of their sphere of influence, and hitherto Great Britain has done nothing. That being the case, last summer Her Majesty's Government and the Imperial British East Africa Company entered into communications with reference to the making of a railway from Mombasa to the Victoria Nyanza. Proposals were made that Her Majesty's Government should grant a subsidy; that they should give a guarantee for the railway. The communications proceeded for some little time, but eventually the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought it was better to proceed with great caution, and that it would be better to have a survey—an ample and full survey—made of the district that it was intended the railway should go through. A Vote, therefore, was placed on the Paper at the end of last Session; but, as the Committee will no doubt remember, a pledge was given by the right hon. Gentleman the then Leader of the House that no contentious measures should be taken after a certain date, but as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby held that this was a contentious measure, Her Majesty's Government withdrew it. At the same time the then Leader of the House

said that the Government would bring it before the House at the earliest opportunity this Session. In the meanwhile, Her Majesty's Government, in order that the valuable winter months should not be lost during which the work in the lower regions near the coast could be carried on, arranged with the British East Africa Company that a survey should be at once commenced. Her Majesty's Government appointed, as the Papers will show, two surveyors, who are now engaged in that task. The British East Africa Company undertook to pay the expenses. Her Majesty's Government at the same time undertook that they would bring this Vote before the House at the earliest opportunity, and use their best endeavours to get the House to accept it. The survey has proceeded. It has already covered, from the last reports we have had, 150 miles. It has reached a place called Tsavo. Out of the 150 miles between the coast and Tsavo, along the Teita route, it appears that only 15 are of a difficult character. The rest are comparatively easy. No doubt there are difficulties in the way. There is one part of the territory which goes by the name of the Mau Escarpment, which is near the lake, in which there will be considerable difficulty. There is, *prima facie*, no reason to suppose that the railway cannot be carried the whole distance. At all events, I think it will be recognised that Her Majesty's Government have proceeded tentatively and cautiously in this matter; and when the survey is complete, and when the report of the survey reaches this country, Her Majesty's Government and the public will then be in a better position to ascertain whether the railway can be completed and carried through, and, if so, at what cost this work can be carried out. The question lies in a nutshell. We stand at the parting of the ways. If we do nothing now we go backwards, because it is perfectly obvious that in consequence of the great cost of maintaining Captain Lugard and those who are with him in Uganda, it is impossible for the British East Africa Company or any Company, or for Her Majesty's Government, to keep Captain Lugard there. He would therefore be with-

Mr. J. W. Lowther

drawn. If he were withdrawn it requires no great amount of prophecy to see that the Mahomedans and those who are on the outskirts of this Christian community of Uganda will at once attack it. The missionaries who are now settled in Uganda will probably be the first to be sacrificed. At all events it will give a spurt to the Slave Trade which the establishment at Uganda is already, in some measure, stopping. It will give a fresh spurt to the trade which it will be very difficult—nay impossible—to put an end to by simply dealing with it on the coast. If we desire to go forward in what I have called the traditional policy of this country the way is clear before us. The means have been pointed out by the unanimous voice of Europe, as expressed in the Brussels Act. The cost, compared with the vast cost we have been put to in maintaining ships off the East Coast of Africa, is comparatively cheap. And, by adopting the alternative which Her Majesty's Government propose, we shall show that our vaunted philanthropy is not a sham, and that our professions of humanitarianism are not the merest hypocrisy.

\* (9.27.) MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): Mr. Courtney, I rise to say a few words on this which I consider a most important Vote, and one which, if agreed to, will carry very important consequences indeed. I have generally been a supporter of the policy of Her Majesty's Government in regard to East Africa; but I have always understood that there were two principles laid down by the Government with regard to which I have always been in agreement with them. They are that this country cannot take part in any armed interference in those countries which are brought within her sphere of influence; and, secondly, that they would not attempt to develop and open up these countries by expenditure from the British Exchequer. Suggestions have been made in both these directions during the negotiations during the last five years with respect to Nyassaland and other parts of Africa. The Government, so far as I know, absolutely negatived proposals placed before them in either direction, and I entirely agree with them. To-night we have

had a most important statement by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs in explanation of this Vote. I think, if I may say so, that the first part of his speech was devoted to showing that the policy which Her Majesty's Government had adopted in this Vote is merely a continuation of their previous policy, and the policy of past Governments. But towards the conclusion of his speech he stated what appeared to me to be a much more accurate description of the policy now being pursued, when he described the introduction and passing of this Vote as a "parting of the ways." He assumed completely the responsibility of Her Majesty's Government in this matter, and did not attempt to lay it on the East Africa Company; and, probably, never was so important a departure submitted to the judgment of the House, without any such adequate information as would enable hon. Members of the House to judge of it being afforded. I think we are entitled to ask for more details for the proper consideration of the question. At first we were asked not to look upon the Company as a purely commercial body; but it really stands in the same position as other Chartered Companies in Africa, and exactly in the same position as the Chartered Company in Borneo; substantially all the chartered companies are identical. The question then arises, was this Company specially charged with the repression of the Slave Trade? Like the other companies it has to discourage to the best of its power, and as far as practicable abolish by degrees, any system of slavery or domestic servitude that exists. The clause dealing with this says that the Company "shall to the best of its power discourage, and so far as practicable abolish slavery;" but that is practically the same clause as appears in other Charters. I am not one of those who object to giving these Charters; I never attempted to describe the work of Chartered Companies as "filibustering by proxy," to quote a phrase once used by a Member of the Government. An attack on the Borneo Company with regard to this very clause was led by the Secretary to the Treasury and supported by the speech and vote of the First Lord of the Treasury; yet here is the East Africa

Company with a similar clause, certainly not stronger, but possibly somewhat weaker in regard to its application, and, therefore, I think we may take it that this Company is in no way specially charged with duties in regard to the repression of the Slave Trade. If it be alleged that that object would be specially served by the construction of a railway through this district, the reply must be that there is really and absolutely no information to support that view. One hon. Member said that there were several slave routes through this district; but so far as our information goes there is really nothing to bear out that statement. I believe the condition of things is all the other way, and that the slave routes, instead of going through the district of the railway goes to the south of it. There is absolutely no slave traffic from Nyanza to Mombasa. Mr. Jackson, who was a surveyor to the British East Africa Company, read a paper at the Royal Geographical Society—and he was followed by a missionary from Uganda—and he stated that the slave routes and trade routes ran all through the German territory round the southern side of Kilima-Njaro. He also said that it was a good route for a railway; but that a railway was impossible because it was through German territory. But this is quite a case in which we are absolutely devoid of information. With regard to the first article of the Brussels Conference I think the hon. Gentleman stretches it to its utmost limits. If everything in that first article could be carried out Africa would be civilised, and the Slave Trade would be done entirely away with. But what I say is that it has not yet been shown that the first work obligatory upon this country is the construction of this railway; nor has it been shown that the alternative, as the hon. Member put it, which we are to adopt was the construction of military posts or the construction of a railway. In fact, if we build the railway we must be prepared to protect it. As I understand, the country is one which presents great physical difficulties, and that it is depopulated by some of the most savage people of Africa. I got a letter only yesterday upon the subject from an engineer who

was in favour of these railways; but he said at the same time the Government must be prepared to fortify their railway, which might be done

“by making the stations fortresses, and that the signal boxes should be constructed on the model of the Martello towers with guns raking the railway up and down.”

Another argument that is used is the commercial argument. We are, of course, all anxious for new markets for British goods. Uganda is the most prosperous part of the district, but the trade routes with rich and prosperous Uganda are not in the direction of this railway, but are either northward through the Nile or southward through the territory which is now under the German sphere of influence. The Government has laid no information upon this subject before us. We should have Captain Lugard's Report on Uganda before us so that we might actually test the value not only of the commercial aspect of the question, and as to the Slave Trade aspect, but also the important political aspect. The Government are endeavouring to take possession of the territory of Uganda and to commit the British Exchequer to a large expenditure of money for the construction of a railway from the coast up to Uganda, in order to hold permanently the political position of that country. But the question of holding Uganda must be decided long before the four or five years in which the railway could be constructed. The Committee ought therefore to have information to enable it to judge—first, in reference to the Slave Trade, whether the new policy and the construction of this railway would really diminish it to any appreciable extent; next, whether the Government intend, if this Vote passes, or when the railway is constructed, to withdraw the cruisers that watch the slavers on the East Coast of Africa. Further, we should have a clear statement as to what the Government, and the Government that succeeds it, are really committed to by this Vote. Substantially the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave us more or less an answer, through a question put last week, that we were only committed to a preliminary survey; but I think we should get a very clear statement, as that one

*Mr. Buchanan*

is rather divergent from the statement by Lord Salisbury in the Blue Book, which states that the money asked for and now to be granted, was not for the survey merely, but for the construction of the railway.

\*(9.50.) MR. GEORGE WYNDHAM (Dover): The hon. Gentleman who has just concluded his speech is quite correct in saying that we are now at the parting of the ways. That opinion is held upon both sides of the House; and, that being so, it is surely a matter of curiosity that hon. Members sitting upon this side should be still in the dark as to whether we are to be accompanied in the way we propose to follow, or whether we are to be allowed to pursue it alone. It is quite true that last July a most bellicose attitude was assumed towards this proposal by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. He described it as matter in the highest degree contentious in its nature; but if the hon. Member who has just sat down may be taken as expressing the views upon that side of the House, it would appear that, abandoning the attitude of absolute hostility, they have adopted one that may be called the attitude of qualified assent or qualified dissent, and that they hope to shunt this question from the position which it now holds in the mind of the people, so that, in the event of obtaining office, they may be able to snap their fingers at the obligations which we believe this country is under in regard to the Slave Trade. The last speaker said that he hoped, whatever the result, neither this Government nor its successor would be absolutely committed to the policy of combating the Slave Trade.

MR. BUCHANAN: I said nothing of the sort; I said that neither this Parliament nor its successor would be committed to the policy of constructing this railway.

MR. WYNDHAM: Then are we now to understand that hon. Members opposite do acknowledge that a new and fresh responsibility and a heavy obligation has been laid upon the Government in consequence of the train of events, beginning with the Despatch of Lord Granville in May,

1885, and culminating in what was practically the ratification of the Act of the Brussels Treaty which was announced at the beginning of the Session? If these obligations are admitted, then this country is in a very different position to any we have hitherto occupied. If it were true that that Conference at Brussels, in which, for the first time, Mahomedan Powers joined hands with European Powers, undertook obligations towards the Slave Trade, then surely we should stand for ever in the pillory as the most Pickaniffian of political hypocrites, if we were to disregard all that has taken place, and proceed exactly as we have hitherto proceeded. If the Brussels Act has any meaning, new obligations have been imposed, and it is our duty to take some action in the British sphere of influence now occupied by the British Imperial East Africa Company. The hon. Member who last spoke drew a comparison between that Company and others, and said that they practically stood upon all-fours, and that if it was the duty of the Government to assist or countenance the East Africa Company in combating the Slave Trade, it might equally be their duty to assist and countenance by grant the South African Company, and, I suppose, also the Niger Company. The hon. Member said the obligation could be no greater. But surely the obligation to fight was greater in face of the enemy than where no enemy was apparent. I think it can hardly be controverted that the Slave Trade exists in East Africa in a greater degree than in any other district over which Great Britain is paramount. In South Africa a large white population renders exceptional measures less obligatory. In West Africa the sea-borne traffic is extinct. In East Africa Great Britain is paramount, and apparently it is the only place in which she can fulfil the new obligations placed upon her by the Berlin Conference. It is in this part of the country that the Government must act, and the reason for our acting is further enforced by the fact that if we do not act nobody else can. There Great Britain is supreme, and there, apparently, we can alone carry out our obligations. Last Ses-



sion questions were addressed to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs in order that a clear distinction might be arrived at between a sphere of influence and a Protectorate. But, setting on one side the fact that over a strip of 10 miles we hold a Protectorate, it is improbable that the electors of this country, or the taxpayers of other countries who have followed our lead, will seize a distinction which hon. Members opposite found difficult to seize, and it is inevitable that the Germans, who paid large sums of money to do their duty, will not hold this country quit of its obligations if we endeavour to ride off on so shallow a plea. It is in East Africa or nowhere this Government must act; and the reason for acting is further enforced by reason of the fact that if we do not act nobody else can. We have assumed responsibilities for the whole of that territory, and neither Germany, nor Italy, nor any other Power can make good our *laches* in this matter. The Germans have expended large sums of money to aid their Company north of the Juba River; the Italians are assisting the Royal Italian Company; and, therefore, we are between two countries that are assisting their companies, and our territory, if we neglect our obligations, will become a sort of cesspool, if I may say so, for all the refuse that is cleared off the surrounding territories. We have also to consider that in this part of Africa the Slave Trade is at its worst; in one of the letters addressed to the Foreign Office and the Treasury, it is stated that the seaboard, to which the Italian, British, and German spheres of influence extend, is practically now the only outlet for slavery, and that in the interior is the source from which that evil springs. If we have a duty to do we must do it there. It is really a curious fact that we are not aware whether the regular Opposition in this House accept that obligation or repudiate it. If they accept it—I will proceed on that hypothesis—it is for them now to decide what instrument or method should be adopted by this Government, along with other Governments, in order to give effect to the policy initiated by Lord Granville, carried on by Lord Salisbury, and now, it seems,

*Mr. Wyndham*

assented to by the Opposition in this House. It is not necessary for me to point out that the alternative is really between the construction of a railway and the employment of a military post and flying columns. The hon. Member who has last spoken, drew a gloomy picture of this part of Africa, and stated that the difficulty of constructing a railway there would be very great; but a study of the map does not endorse that view. I have studied the map, and made myself acquainted with the views of those who have been in that country; and they tell me that the the first 150 miles is a fair sample of the first 360 miles; and that out of the first 150 miles only 15 miles present any engineering difficulties. A railway will be more cheap and peaceful than any military occupation of the country; and, naturally, this House should pause before it contemplates placing soldiers in East Africa, because they must be black soldiers, and it may be considered a somewhat doubtful blessing for that land to place such a body of men upon it. A railway, therefore, as I have pointed out, would not only combat the Slave Trade more effectually than any occupation of the country at the present time, but it would also give some promise of a final cure of this evil. Having taken the trouble to visit the offices of this Company, I have been informed that according to their calculation they would be able to convey a ton of goods for a maximum rate of £3 by railway, and that the same quantity now costs £300 as carried by porters. No caravan could compete on these terms; and human porters could no longer be used in order to encourage the Slave Trade. The Slave Trade could no more exist under these circumstances than could piracy when letters of marque ceased to be given to legitimate privateers on the cessation of war. It appears to me that no question of employing or not employing this Company need be considered by the House. If it is our duty to carry out the provisions of the Brussels Conference, and if the construction of a railway after this survey should prove to be the best method of carrying out those provisions, then I say we should

not hesitate to combat the Slave Trade by making a railway through this territory. The Party represented by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite are extremely fond of posing as more strenuous friends of humanity than the Party to which I belong on this side of the House. I hold in my hand a document entitled "Twenty-five Reasons for Supporting the Liberal Party," and in the very front of this document I see it stated that this country is to support the Liberal Party "because they abolished negro labour in the British dominions." Surely they could appeal to the country on more practical and less antiquated grounds if they were to say they were prepared to support the policy which affords the only chance of combating the Slave Trade where it is worst, where it can be most easily suppressed by the measure before the House, and where we are most directly responsible for its suppression. I say the measure before the House, because, although we are only called upon to sanction a survey, I hope, in common, I believe, with many who support the Government, that in the event of a survey proving a railway to be practicable and effective a railway will be begun and completed. Everybody must remember that it was the Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian who sent out some 10,000 or 12,000 Englishmen in order to construct a railway from Suakin to Berber, and after they constructed 40 miles of the line abandoned it to the tribes inhabiting that district. Now, I believe it is less extravagant to complete a railway, if money were spent on the survey, than to construct 40 miles of it and then leave the work as a monument of irresolution. If this duty of taking new measures to combat the Slave Trade is laid upon us, and if this railway is the best instrument for discharging it, we have only to consider what agent we shall employ. Many hon. Gentlemen object to employing a company under any circumstances. They object to setting-up such a precedent. But, in the first place, there is no probability that a precedent will be set. Survey the map of the world, and nowhere else will you find a spot in which slavery is rife, in which we are

responsible, in which a railway is the obvious weapon for combating slavery, and in which a company is prepared to construct that railway. But, in the second place, should such a combination again occur, then I trust that by our action to-day we shall set a precedent, and that that precedent will be followed. From the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who has last spoken, it would seem that he can only view this question of obligation with reference to the commercial prospect of the undertaking. Surely when we bind ourselves to combat slavery we cannot do so only when we get a chance of realising a good dividend upon our investment. If that be the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite, they should have taken exception to the method laid down in the Brussels Act when it was first mooted; surely the argument based upon the effect this undertaking may have upon the prospects of commerce ought not to weigh with us in this matter, whether we hold that it will pay, or fail to pay, interest on our money. I say pay or fail to pay, for whereas some seem to fear that money will be lost, others are alarmed at the idea that the Company will profit. But, if it does, who will be a penny the worse? Assuming, for the sake of argument, that British commerce is an evil to native populations—but only for the sake of argument, for from Captain Lugard's Report it is clear that trade as conducted by this Company can only prove beneficial—still, assuming Christian commerce to be an evil, is it the only one which disturbs the Golden Age existing in the imagination of some persons around the shores of the Equatorial Lakes? No, Sir; these remnants of the Saturnian reign are disturbed not only by the Christian trader, but by the Mahomedan slave-driver; and, admitting both to be evils, the second must be held to be by far the graver of the two. The presence of Christian commerce there would only be an evil as vaccination is an evil; preventing a more virulent disease. But, turning from the point of view of the natives to that of the electors of this country, the proposal of the Government is no evil at all. Those who returned us to power are in favour

of the African policy which has been so successfully administered by Lord Salisbury; and my recent experience, in the constituencies that hon. Members opposite are apt to quote as types and models for all constituencies, has led me to believe that even the electors that returned them to power are not averse to a forward policy in Africa. This was shown down at Rossendale. I hold in my hand a bill which was widely distributed there, asking the electors to

"Vote for Maden, because the Unionist Government, by its default, has allowed France to outstrip us in the race on the West Coast of Africa."

In Rossendale the electors were asked to vote against the Government candidate, because France had been allowed to outstrip us on the West Coast of Africa; it is, therefore, from the Opposition point of view, their interests to see that we are not outstripped in the East of Africa. The policy of non-extension originated in a Resolution of this House, passed in 1865, I believe when Lord John Russell was Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and it was laid down then that this policy of non-extension admitted of no exception as regards new settlements, but cannot amount to absolute prohibition of measures which in peculiar cases it may be necessary that the settlement should possess. Is that the present policy of the Liberal Party? If we knew that it is their policy then we should know where we are. I should be very glad to hear in the course of this evening whether they do advise us that we should avoid all risk and responsibility. If that is their advice, it is one which it will be very difficult to follow or attend to in this country, for risk must be incurred by this Empire until the last trace of our enterprise has disappeared, and from responsibility in connection with slavery we cannot hope for release until the last spark of compassion has been extinguished in the breast of the last Englishman.

(10.20.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The statement of the Under Secretary for State in introducing his Estimate was, I thought, as far as it went, a fair statement, and did not, like the speech of the hon.

Mr. Wyndham

Gentleman who has just sat down, endeavour to give a Party colour to the question. It stated perfectly fairly what the view of the Government is. I must also thank the hon. Member for his candour in the account which he gave of Uganda, at least in one respect, because he told us that the cost of maintaining British influence there would be enormous. But the hon. Gentleman, to my disappointment, did not address himself particularly to the task of giving particulars. He did not give us the particulars of the Slave Trade in that country, the cost of the railroad or the ideas which the Government were going to follow after the railroad is constructed—all matters which seem to me of great interest. And the hon. Member for Dover, who has just sat down, did not seem anxious to supply these particulars; but he rather preferred to discuss the question of the Suakin and Berber Railway, and of the West Coast of Africa. There is one point which was not overstated by my right hon. Friend the Under Secretary when he spoke about the parting of the ways: and what I should like to invite the Government to give us is—not the view they take as to where the road will lead to, but to give us some more particular information than their Papers give us with regard to the obligations they meant to contract, and the best means of discharging these obligations. Certainly the production of these Papers and the speech of the Under Secretary furnish the best justification that could be desired for the course taken by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, when he insisted that this Estimate should not pass last July as a non-contentious matter, *sub silentio*; but that in a matter of this very great gravity we ought to have much fuller information than the Government has now given us. The correspondence laid before us in this short Paper tells us what the view, upon the general question of policy, of the Foreign Office and the Treasury is, what progress has been made with the survey for some short distance; but it does not deal with the issues involved. I shall endeavour to state what the issues are. I begin by assuming, and I think I may from the correspondence assume, that this is

really not a question of a grant for a survey, but it is a question of subsidy or guarantee to the East Africa Railway Company. I say that with confidence, and for two reasons. In the first place, the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered a speech in Scotland which was addressed to this question of subsidy or guarantee, and in which he endeavoured to charge the Opposition with the unpatriotic conduct of endeavouring to oppose a forward policy in Africa. And in the second place, if hon. Members will look at these Parliamentary Papers, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, they will see that the argument has been entirely addressed to the question of subsidy or guarantee. The argument in Paper No. 2 is substantially an argument to prove that the Slave Trade is not to be suppressed by the Brussels Act unless by a railroad; that that railroad could not be made without a subsidy or guarantee, and that, therefore, we are bound to vote money for the purpose. It is quite true that we are only asked at the present moment for a grant of £20,000; but if we allowed this Vote for £20,000 to pass unchallenged, it would be but the naturally obvious course to say that this Vote was supported and demanded upon the arguments stated in this paper, and by assenting to it, we must be deemed to be assenting to the policy which the Government have declared. I should like to put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few questions which these Papers do not answer. One of them—the most obvious—is the question what the probable expenditure upon the railway will be. It appears from the Papers we have that Sir John Fowler has made an approximate estimate of what the expenditure upon the railway will be; but we have only heard rumours of this estimate. We should like to know what foundation there is for these rumours. We should be glad to be told what this Government has been informed is likely to be the cost—even the minimum cost—of the contemplated railway. We should like also, I think, to be furnished with a map, which would enable Members of the House more conveniently to understand the situation of this country through which the proposed railroad is to pass, and to

perceive what these regions are; and I think that would be much more perceivable if such a map had been appended to them. And more than that, we should like to have a copy of the Report of Captain Lugard. It is a Report of the utmost interest and value. A brief extract of the Report was contained in the *Times* newspaper on the 23rd of February. This Report of Captain Lugard was made at the beginning of 1891, and has been in the hands of the East Africa Company for a year or more, and might, I think with advantage, be presented to the House. The right hon. Gentleman perhaps may ask me why I think so; and my answer would be, because the Government are proposing that this country should virtually become a partner with the East Africa Company in this undertaking, and that under these circumstances they ought to give us what information they have in their possession.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: This Report of Captain Lugard is a Report which was addressed to the East Africa Company, and over which, therefore, so far the Government have no control. ("Oh oh!") I do not know why my hon. Friend objects to that. Of course the House may say, "We will not vote the money unless we see the Report"; but, on the other hand, I say that, as a Government, the Report does not belong to us. This Report is of a distinctly confidential character, relating to the actions of certain persons and Governments, and is certainly not a Report which was written or intended for publication. Every Government has agents who make confidential Reports in reference to matters in the negotiation of which they are engaged. If a Government were to be called upon to give publicity to a confidential Report which their agent had made, explaining his negotiation and the attitude he has taken, it might very seriously compromise these negotiations if it were to go back to the parties with whom he was negotiating. I think the House will clearly understand, therefore, that this Report cannot be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. BRYCE: I am much obliged to my right hon. Friend for the statement which he has just made. But I should like to remind him that, having had an opportunity of reading the Report, I could find nothing on the face of the Report which indicated that it was of a confidential character. It has, I believe, come into the hands of a good many Members. I should like to point out further to my right hon. Friend that the East Africa Company are coming to us as suppliants, that they are coming to us to help them out of their difficulties, because it is admitted that they are not able to protect themselves. When we are asked to embark in an enterprise of this kind we are entitled to a full disclosure of the material facts, and the disposition to avoid that is calculated to arouse suspicion. I must say that a great deal which is contained in this Report is material, and it has suggested to me a number of questions which I hope the Government will endeavour to answer, because on their answer will depend the attitude we shall assume and the judgment the country will form. Now, Sir, I find that no information has been given by the Government as regards the existence of slavery in this particular part of the country. The Under Secretary lightly assumed that the horrors we heard of occurred within the sphere of influence. I believe there has been little or no information of any slavery in the territories of the British East Africa Company. In the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* there is an article which bears marks of having proceeded from a competent and experienced hand, a man who was obviously well informed, and who asserted that so far from the proposed railway destroying the Slave Trade, it would have little or no effect. But I am going to call a better witness—namely, Captain Lugard himself. At page 29 of his Report he says, describing his proceedings in Uganda—

"The abolition of the Slave Trade was readily agreed to being practically non-existent now."

I do not know whether that is one of the facts it is intended to be treated as confidential. And, in fact, the state of

things is substantially admitted in the letter of the Foreign Office to the Treasury. The Under Secretary has spoken of the expense of the cruisers. We spend more than any other country in the suppression of the Slave Trade, the cost of cruisers alone amounting to £100,000 a year. It is said that this money will be saved if the railway is made; but the Slave Trade in East Africa now exists along three main routes. The first from the region of the Upper Nile down to the Red Sea, the second down to the German port of Bagamoyo, and the third line is Nyassaland, where it comes up to the Mozambique. As the Slave Trade goes to the coast, the cruisers would have to be kept there, and the Slave Trade will not be appreciably diminished by this strip of railway. I will not say much on the question of trade, although Captain Lugard's Report contains some instructive remarks on that point. He describes a considerable portion of the country that the railway is to traverse between Mombasa and the Lakes as being practically uninhabited, and for the rest inhabited by very savage tribes who are not likely to furnish what is called remunerative local traffic. Anything more discouraging than his Report I cannot imagine; and if the Government propose to raise any money for this railway, they would do well not to publish this Report. Then, Sir, the Government have not told us anything about the condition of the Company, although the country is practically asked to go into partnership with it. We are entitled to know something about the solvency of our partners, their capacity to bear their share of the burden, their management and prospects, and their capital. No information has been supplied to us on these points, and when we ask for it we are told to call at the office in Pall Mall. One important fact mentioned by Captain Lugard is that the tsetse fly does not exist in the territories, and that animals can be employed there. Now, Sir, I feel the duty we have as a great nation that has borne an honourable part in putting down the Slave Trade. There is no dispute about that. Livingstone said, "The Slave Trade is the open sore of the world"; and it is admitted

that we must take all reasonable and proper means to work against it. I do not recede from what I said on this subject a year and a half ago. But I must review the ground of obligation now put before us. We are told that we are bound, in respect of the proceedings of the Brussels General Act, to do all we can to suppress the Slave Traffic. The Powers declared that the most effective means of counteracting the Slave Trade were—first, the progressive organisation of the Services; next, the establishment of occupying stations; thirdly, the construction of roads, and particularly of railroads, and so on. But all these provisions are expressly stated to be applicable in what district? In the African territories placed under the Sovereignty or Protectorate of civilised nations. I call attention to these particular words, which are repeated in Article 4, to which the hon. Member alluded. Now, this is not a case of Sovereignty or of Protectorate, but of a sphere of influence, which is a totally different thing. Sovereignty we know and Protectorate we know, but what is a sphere of influence? Fortunately, on this point we have a definition from Lord Salisbury, who, speaking at the Mansion House in August, 1890, descanted with commendable frankness on the proceedings for the delimitation of the sphere of influence in Africa. He said he had been engaged in what the satirist would call the task of drawing lines upon maps on which no human foot had ever trod, and dividing territories which did not belong to them, but which, indeed, belonged to other people; and he told his hearers to read between the lines in order to see that what the Government was doing was contributing their *quota* to the glorious work of the peace of the world. Now, that simply means that Germany, Italy, and ourselves agree that between certain lines we would not interfere with one another. It has been admitted by the Postmaster General that in this sphere of influence Her Majesty has no Sovereignty, and that we have no Protectorate, and that there is nothing beyond this that Germany and Italy have no particular right. This does not come within the Brussels Act, because it is neither a Sovereignty nor

a Protectorate. The Brussels Conference wisely refrained from expressing any opinion upon a sphere of influence, because the diplomatists who then assembled knew very well that a sphere of influence where no legal authority existed, and where the natives were left to themselves, could not be made subject to these stipulations. Now, shall we, by making this railway, actually repress the Slave Trade? I ask the Government to say whether the construction of the railway will have any effect in that direction. There is another question. How is this railway to be made? Captain Lugard says his men were always deserting. The standing difficulty is to get soldiers and porters and others to carry you through the hostile tribes. There are no means of obtaining indigenous free labour to make this railway. The only means will be to bring coolies from India, or Chinese, or resort to the expedient of African explorers and use slave labour. That is another point on which we are entitled to information. Now, Sir, the Committee will notice that the Government have put their case as an alternative to the establishment of garrisons and flying columns. But it is clear that when you have made the railway your first difficulty will be to guard it. Captain Lugard says the common article of currency in Maisai land is iron wire, and he speaks of the difficulty of maintaining the line against the Maisais. A railway through the land of the Maisais will be more valuable to them than a gold mine, and nothing less than a line of forts and garrisons will be sufficient to protect the railway, and we shall have all that expense in addition to the expense of construction. Another point I should like to have dwelt upon, had time permitted, is this—that we have no jurisdiction in the territory except over British subjects. It seems to me that the Government present their case thus: A survey involves a guarantee, a guarantee necessarily involves defence, defence involves annexation; and so what we are substantially asked to do is to take the first step towards annexation. I do not believe there is any escape from that fatal descent, and, therefore, the Committee and the country should pause to consider the position in which they stand.

In Equatorial Africa we have a country that is neither fit for European centres, nor, like India, a country of ancient civilisation which can be governed with comparative ease. Moreover, it is a country which has no defined frontier. In these circumstances, I put it to the Committee that we ought, at this moment, to require a far fuller statement of facts than we have yet had; and we ought seriously to consider, when asked to take such a step, what that step means, and what are the ultimate consequences that it may involve.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: I frankly admit that many of the questions put to me by the hon. and learned Gentleman are questions which ought fairly to be put to the Government, and require an answer. I will deal with some of the minor points in the first instance. A question was asked as to our relations with the Imperial British East Africa Company, and whether it is solvent. That is a matter as to which we must satisfy ourselves. We must know whether they are able to carry out the railway, but there is no obligation of any kind upon us until the survey is completed. We are waiting for that information before undertaking any liability of any kind, and the very object of the survey is to get an answer to many of those questions which the hon. Gentleman wishes us to answer before the survey is completed. The Government are anxious to proceed with caution in this matter; and it would be the duty of the Government, supposing the survey were thoroughly satisfactory, before they undertook to give a guarantee to any company, to see that the powers of that company were adequate to carrying out the operations. In the first negotiations that took place I pointed out to the representatives of the Company, and I laid it down as an absolute condition, that care would have to be taken to see that there was such financial support—such financial power behind any company to whom we should give a guarantee—as would secure that that company should have power to carry out the railway, whatever it might cost. We should not give a guarantee without satisfying ourselves on that point. I do not for

a moment say that the East Africa Company would in itself have sufficient power. We have to consider whether this railway can be built, whether it can be built within the limits of the guarantee as the House would sanction and the country would approve. That, I hope, is a full answer to the hon. Gentleman's questions respecting the guarantees. We shall for and insist upon those guarantees with the necessary financial strength when the proper time arrives. Now the hon. Gentleman raised one very important point towards the end of his speech, and that was whether we were free from all obligations to the Brussels Conference, because this is a sphere of influence and not a Protectorate.

MR. BRYCE: I said we were under no obligation as respects the sphere of influence. I did not say anything about a Protectorate.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: Very well. That according to the hon. and learned Gentleman, this was our position when we went into the Brussels Conference—that we were to induce all other countries who had Protectorates to the South and Protectorates to the North that they were to take all means for putting down the Slave Trade, while we in the middle were to ride off on the ground that we had not a Protectorate. And therefore, in the eloquent words of the hon. Friend behind me, we were to be in this sphere of influence without taking any action, whilst at the same time encouraging others to go forward both to the North and to the South. In that case I confess that I think we should have cut only a sorry figure if we were to encourage Belgium, Italy, Germany and Portugal to take those measures whilst we held our hands and would do nothing.

MR. BRYCE: I do not think it right hon. Gentleman appreciates the argument. I said that the Brussels Conference expressly extended to Protectorates and Sovereignities.

\*MR. GOSCHEN: But Germany is operating in her sphere of influence.

MR. BRYCE: What evidence have you of that?

\*MR. GOSCHEN: If the hon. Gentleman follows the course of events, he will see that the Germans are very active indeed in their sphere of influence.

*Mr. Bryce*

and the sum of money she has spent something that would alarm the House of Commons. Where is a railway intended to operate less in the sphere of influence? That is my answer to the hon. and learned Gentleman so far as the sphere of influence is concerned. When towards the conclusion of my speech, the hon. Gentleman said that we were entering on a certain chain of undertakings which would lead to annexation. In this way—first, the survey, then the railway, then the fortified posts, and in the end the annexation. Well, I would point out to the hon. Gentleman that with regard to the whole state of the country he seems to me not really to have studied the Reports which have evidently been at his command. He thinks that there is nothing to be done; that there is no slavery as I understood the hon. Gentleman—

**MR. BRYCE:** No, I said it was not one of the slave routes, and I quoted Captain Lugard to prove it.

**MR. GOSCHEN:** But the hon. Gentleman did not quote all Captain Lugard. On this point, for Captain Lugard stated that he himself met a slave caravan on his road up, and that he himself liberated the slaves attached to it. Now, is it quite fair of the hon. Gentleman to state that Captain Lugard made this observation with regard to slave caravans, and at the same time not to inform the House that Captain Lugard had met a caravan and liberated the slaves?

**MR. BRYCE:** The only reason I did not refer to that was, because it was obviously a slave caravan that was engaged in what is called the local traffic, which is a totally different thing from caravans of slaves coming down to the coast, and when Captain Lugard's Report is produced hon. Members will see what that difference is.

**MR. GOSCHEN:** Well, then, have we no duties with regard to the local traffic in slaves? We have never drawn a distinction between the local traffic and the traffic down to the Coast. No, Sir; we wish to put down the traffic where it exists, and the atrocities which accompany one of these caravans will not be less than in the other cases. We have it from the hon. Gentleman

now himself that there is local traffic in slaves and local traffic on the lines through which the railway is to pass. That observation breaks down the argument of the hon. Gentleman that there is no slave traffic on this route at all events, and no caravan of slaves to be found. The hon. Gentleman says he thinks that Captain Lugard's Report has been kept back because it is considered likely to damage the case for the railway. I must say that such an idea never entered into my mind. I had no idea that hon. Members would read Captain Lugard's Report in the sense of its being contrary to the general policy which we recommend. I should think that it was just the opposite. The Reports which Captain Lugard gives are graphic Reports. But what we want is this. We want a Report made to ourselves, by an engineer whom we have appointed, so that we may be able not to count simply on the views of others who are employed by parties who may be considered to be interested. We wish to have an independent Report, and for that purpose we appointed an independent engineer. That, I think at any rate, whatever hon. Gentlemen think of the wisdom of the course, will be considered as a fair and proper step to take—to endeavour to get an independent Report on the whole of this line. The hon. Gentleman has pressed me for a good deal of information which I trust will be in the hands of the Committee or of the House when we ask them to assent to a guarantee for the railway. But that is the time when many of the questions as to the value of the railway, as to the prospects of the railway, as to the possibility of the railway, will be able to be answered. We did not come to the House and ask them to vote a guarantee for the railway until we were able to put the information into their hands which would justify us in making this demand; but we do think that the information is sufficient to authorise us to ask the House to commit themselves to the expenditure of £20,000, which would put us in a position to judge of the steps which ought to be taken. The hon. Gentleman spoke of having to fortify this railway, or rather to establish posts along the railway—for it was another hon. Member



who used the actual words to "fortify this railway," and the hon. Gentleman also asked by what means the labour could be found for the railway. He asked if it was to be by hired slaves. Well, I am glad to have this opportunity of reminding the House that the Imperial British East Africa Company has already liberated 4,000 slaves. There is a sample of the work which can be done. They have already liberated 4,000 slaves, and they trust, under the proclamations that have been issued and the progress that is being made, that free labour will from month to month and from year to year become infinitely more abundant. The hon. Member will further see, with regard to the difficulties of constructing the railway through the territories which he describes, that the very fact of a railway being built enables you to concentrate a number of men in a given spot in a way in which you could never concentrate men if they have to go on foot, and consequently 100 men who are able to pass rapidly from post to post would be able to do the work which 1,000 men would not be able to do if they had to traverse the roads. The railway will open up the country; and already I believe there are very satisfactory symptoms of the country becoming more settled. As a result of what has already been done, I hear that savage tribes are less in evidence; and 750 porters have gone from the lake to the coast without an armed escort, a thing which was quite impossible before, and thus from both points—both from the lake itself and from Mombasa, it will be possible to concentrate the labour necessary to construct the railways. But if it is impossible, what will happen? Captain Macdonald will report that the labour cannot be found. He will report on the density of the population along the road. The hon. Member was not correct in his summary of Captain Lugard's Report. There are portions of the road which are densely populated, portions where grain can be grown and where there is every prospect of a large trade; and everyone will see that if it be possible to have a railway it will be a first step taken towards the civilising of Equatorial Africa in a manner that has never been possible hitherto. You have

had several bodies of pioneers who have carried their lives in their hands and have established themselves there; but if you can once get a railway through I think you would find results produced towards civilisation that would astonish and gratify the House. Our obligations under the Brussels Conference I think are such that we are compelled to take some step; but independently of that I think the interest shown by the commercial world and in our manufacturing towns proves that they wish, through a survey, at least to understand whether markets cannot be opened up in that region. What we ask the House for is simply an experimental survey. That experiment, I am sure, must commend itself to the great majority of the country. Even if it should prove that it is impossible to construct a railway, at all events we shall have done something, and we shall not only have shown—if it is to be shown—that the physical difficulties are such that they cannot be overcome, but we shall also have obtained valuable information which we believe will be of great advantage in many respects to many classes in the country.

(11.12.) MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I cannot complain of the tone of the right hon. Gentleman, but he knows the respect I have for his abilities, and he will forgive me for saying that in his speech he failed to cover the whole field of the discussion, or to bring out points that are really in the minds of hon. Members, so far as my knowledge of opinion goes on this side of the House—that he did little or nothing towards promoting a settlement of this matter.

MR. GOSCHEN: I did not wish to be too long.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I am in the same predicament. I do not think it is possible to take a perfectly full discussion of this subject. I wish to limit myself to a great degree to noticing the points dealt with by the right hon. Gentleman, instead of doing what I could have wished to do—namely, to survey the whole of the arguments in this most important question. Well, now, Sir, I wish to begin with two admissions which are agreeable, for the whole subject, I confess, is not

*Mr. Goschen*

agreeable, since I shall find it my duty very seriously to complain of the conduct of the Government with regard to the subject. With all due respect to the hon. Member for Dover, I am aware of no reason whatever why this should be made a Party question. The hon. Member for Dover did what little was in his power to envenom the discussion by introducing into this question invidious contrasts with what he alleged had been done by other Governments. I shall not follow the hon. Gentleman in his contention. My opinion that this is no Party question is shared, I know, by many Gentlemen on this side of the House. All the pleas I shall urge will be pleas urged by me as a Member of the House of Commons, having no relation to the principles or opinions of this Party or of that. There is another important admission. My hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen in the course of his able speech, made most important and very large statements with regard to the obligations incumbent on this country with reference to the Slave Trade. I wish to say that although those statements were large I will go the whole length with him. I know that wherever it can be shown by rational and ascertained evidence that there is a reasonable prospect of contributing by effort of our own to the abolition or even the great restriction of the African Slave Trade, the memory of what has taken place in former generations from the date of the Assiento Treaty downwards, ought to bring to our mind the conviction that we should take a large and liberal view of any proposition of that kind, provided it fulfil those first conditions which it is our absolute and inexorable duty to ascertain—that is to say, showing to us that the case has been examined, that with the evidence before us it is reasonable and sufficient, and that by entering upon a given course of action we may hope to do something in the view of that capital and most important object. So far, therefore, Sir, I believe there is no question in dispute between us. But the hon. Member for Dover has argued this case entirely as if the importance of the object in view exempted us from any duty in ascertaining that the means proposed were likely to attain

that object. There was not a syllable in his speech, I think, which appeared to admit or to imply that any inquiry whatever in regard to the sufficiency of these means, and the reasonableness of this undertaking, was itself compatible with general notions of what was right. There was not a single sentiment in his speech which in any way recognised any of the difficulties. Sir, the difficulties exist for us, whatever be the value of the purpose we have in view. It is our duty to ascertain the tendency of what is proposed to us to attain that purpose, and it is our duty also to ascertain that in the endeavour to attain that purpose we shall not commit other errors, and perhaps even give countenance to crimes such as, if they were presented to us, we should recoil from with horror. I am here to complain of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government. We have before us no information whatever. It is an entire mistake to call these Parliamentary Papers information. Inter-departmental correspondence upon the question of a scheme in Africa and the opinions of Lord Salisbury and the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman are matters very proper to be stated in Debate for our cognizance, for us to deal with as well as we can—to accept, to criticise, or to refuse. But they are not information for the case. There is not a scrap of information in these Papers upon the subject. There is, indeed, one statement of what ought to be information, and unfortunately it is a statement totally, though unintentionally, untrue, and that is a statement on which Lord Salisbury relies, and on which the right hon. Gentleman relies—that we are called upon to proceed in fulfilment of these obligations. The Brussels Conference includes no reference to the subject whatever. The Brussels Conference by necessary inference excludes this subject, and shows that it has nothing whatever to do with the proposal of Her Majesty's Government. My hon. Friend has read the words, and those words the right hon. Gentleman has not thought proper to notice.

“The Brussels Conference declare that they are to act by progressive organisation of the administrative, judicial, religious, and military

services in the African territories placed under the sovereignty or protectorate of civilised nations"—

with the evident and studied exclusion of what are termed "the spheres of influence." Without the smallest qualification this Brussels Conference—which is made the basis of the argument of Lord Salisbury—has no concern whatever with the proposal that is now made. That is an important point on which the Government cannot be too broadly challenged. I think they have been challenged broadly enough by my hon. Friend near me; but as the right hon. Gentleman has, to borrow a phrase that is used in these Papers, "made a detour" in his speech, and gone round the point, I am obliged to return to it and to impress this important matter upon the House. We have no information on that point—none whatever. Is it proper that we should be called upon to take steps of this kind without that information? But we are not altogether excluded from information. There is the Report of Captain Lugard—a Report addressed not to the Government, but to the Company with whom the Government are going to enter into partnership. The Government are not only going to enter into partnership with the East Africa Company, but they are going to commit to the Company the execution of this railway and the construction of the railroad, should it go forward. How, then, is it possible for you to separate yourselves from the knowledge that has been acquired by the officers of the East Africa Company. The right hon. Gentleman can have no evil motive for withholding Captain Lugard's Report, because he frankly says—and I have no doubt he implicitly believes—that the Report of Captain Lugard is a Report altogether favourable to the proposal that he now makes. Well, that is another argument for the production of this Report. The Report is full of the most important information; but we think it contains information showing that in the present state of things we ought not to entertain the proposal of the Government. Why not produce the Report that the public and the House may be able to judge? It is really necessary that we should

have these Reports produced. This is authentic information—important information, in the absence of all other information. Captain Lugard's Report makes upon me—and I have no doubt it made on the right hon. Gentleman—the impression that whether these proceedings towards the natives may be juridically justifiable or not, yet, that he is a frank man, a brave man, an able man, and an upright man, and he has had admirable opportunities of forming a judgment on the matter. His Report bristles with propositions, and throws a most important light on the subject before us; and that Report ought to be in the hands of the House. Instead of that, we are given these Papers—in which there is only the letter of Sir Guildford Molesworth—that contain anything approaching information at all. And this is rather ludicrous as showing the manner in which the Government have thought proper to bring forward the matter, that in this Report of Sir Guildford Molesworth, reference is made to "the accompanying map." There is no "accompanying map." And why is there no accompanying map? Is it because we are all so familiar with the country? I refer to the words of Lord Salisbury, who tells us that we know nothing about the details of the country. Why is some information not given us to prevent us wandering and stumbling in the dark when we are discussing this matter? I wish to state, in the most expressive terms that I can command, that I am determined for one to exempt myself, by the declaration of to-night, from every jot and tittle of responsibility connected with this undertaking; and yet, at the same time, I do not go so far as to deliver a final judgment. (Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!" and laughter.) Hon. Members opposite who laugh seem to think that such a thing as suspense of judgment, in the absence of information, is highly irrational. I leave those gentlemen to the full enjoyment of that comfortable state of mind in which they alone can entertain such a proposition. But what I have said already is this: that we have no information whatever upon this subject supplied to us by the Government—none for which the Government makes itself responsible.

*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*

How, then, are we to form a final judgment on the question? We have not got absolute knowledge. We have presumptions and indications, and all these presumptions and indications are most adverse to the plan of Her Majesty's Government. And now I come distinctly and directly to what has been stated by the right hon. Gentleman. He first of all treated of the solvency of the East Africa Company. I will not pursue that question very far. All that we know at present is that this great company, which is undertaking such enormous obligations, is not able to command a sum of £20,000 for the purpose of making this preliminary survey. I think that is the ground upon which the present proposal is made. Then, again, I do not say that the company is not solvent. All I say is, we have not got information as to the solvency of the company. The only fact that we have to go upon, and from which presumption may arise, is that the company cannot produce £20,000, and that, therefore, the Government is called in. Then, what says the right hon. Gentleman—and I think this was the heart and centre of his speech. He says—

“Your time for opposition is not yet come. You are not now going to commit yourselves to making the railway.”

I certainly, in these circumstances, would not hold myself committed to anything of the kind; but, so far, I am very glad to have the admission so distinctly made. “But,” says the right hon. Gentleman, “your time for objecting is not yet come,” because admitting, as apparently he did admit, that we do not possess a great deal of the necessary information, he says—

“We are going to institute this survey for the very purpose of getting that information.”

And the right hon. Gentleman makes this argument: that it is irrational in us to interfere with this laudable and beneficent object of getting information through the medium of a survey. If this were a question of a survey in the County of Middlesex for the railway we are going to discuss to-morrow, or a survey in any even uncivilised, if peaceful, land, I could understand the argument of the right hon. Gentleman.

But what security can the right hon. Gentleman give me that the operation of making this survey is to be a bloodless operation? No doubt he intends it to be pacific; no doubt he has excellent objects in view; but I say that the making of this survey is, according to such information as is before us, attended with the same dangers as the making of the railway. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Masai tribe are not so strong as they were; but what do we know from one source or from another as to the influences and powers that will confront us when we set foot in East Africa? We know this, that the greatest jealousy prevails in that country and must, naturally, among the natives with regard to any attempts to dispossess them of their lands. Is not that exactly the thing we are going to do? Well, then, there is no doubt about the jealousy. Is there no tendency in our survey for a railway, and our establishing a road into the country which we are there permanently to maintain, which road itself requires the assumption of property in land when it comes to be made—is there no tendency there to stir that jealousy on the part of the natives? What does Captain Lugard say? He says that he is about to be attacked; and why is he about to be attacked? Because he has been endeavouring to make a stockade to defend himself from the attacks of others, and even that is an act so serious and formidable in the present state of that country, that he says he understands he is to be attacked on that account. But this is not a question of presumption only. We have plenty of evidence on that subject. What are the indications that you have offered of friendliness, or of neutrality, in the country where you are going to make your survey? Is it a survey in the view of Sir Guildford Molesworth, whose letter inspires one, as far as such a letter can, with every confidence in his judgment and integrity, which is in itself essentially peaceful, and will excite no jealousy or hostility on the part of the natives? No. It is a survey which cannot be made without the presence of many hundreds of armed men. Is it expected that there will be employment for those men?

MR. GOSCHEN: Perhaps my right hon. Friend will permit me to answer. As a matter of fact there are 40 armed men who have gone with the party. They are taken from India, and are at the same time assistant surveyors, who have been accustomed to surveying in India. They will afford protection, and at the same time assist in the survey.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I can quite understand that at the present moment and close to the coast the necessity is less, but I am surprised that in a country which is entirely peaceful, and close to the coast, 40 armed men should be needed. What does Sir Guildford Molesworth say on this subject? The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer says the Masai have become very weak. Does he derive that from Sir Guildford Molesworth? But I am going to show that even the scanty Parliamentary Papers he has placed before us contradict what he has said. Sir Guildford Molesworth says that the expedition conducted by Dr. Carl Peters, which eventually led to the fruitless slaughter of a large number of the Masai, has excited such strong hostility against Europeans that any expedition that may be organised must have an escort sufficiently strong to resist any attack made upon it. That is the peaceful survey which the right hon. Gentleman says he is undertaking as a preliminary operation in order that, being at present wholly destitute of all information, he may put himself in a position to give us some portion of such information after he has completed the survey. Are you better off when you get into Uganda? Can you count upon friendship there? Is the King of that country friendly to you? (Some cries of "Yes" from the Ministerial Benches.) What? (Renewed cries of "Yes.") Does anyone venture to say that he is friendly? (Renewed cries of "Yes.") Very well. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Dover is responsible, but I say that, at any rate, his responsibility will not enable him to stand against the evidence of Captain Lugard. What says Captain Lugard? He has framed a Treaty with King Mwanga. From that Sovereign he has extorted a Treaty. He tells you how he obtained

it. He obtained it by threats and by compulsion. He says that he obtained it with the greatest difficulty, and that with every effort to escape it this wretched Sovereign signed the Treaty. He states, not admits merely, that the Sovereign will make every effort to escape from it, and in that Treaty Captain Lugard, as far as we can judge from the terms of the Treaty, which he gives, has not ventured to include the slightest reference to the acquisition of land. He is going to survey, he is going to make a railway, he is going to meet all the responsibilities that that will entail, and yet he does not venture to make in the terms of his Treaty the slightest reference to the acquisition of land. Then where is the friendliness of this King Mwanga? Captain Lugard says he effected his point by going into the country with extreme rapidity, and that it was by the extreme rapidity of his movements that he prevented the natives from getting out their troops to oppose him, because they had not time to do it. That is the country where a peaceful survey is to be made. Captain Lugard says that at a certain point upon his journey he understood that King Mwanga had put to death two of his subjects for not preventing his passage. He says—

"I have thought it prudent to postpone all inquiry as to whether that account of the killing of these two men is true or not."

On whose friendship then do you rely? The bulk of the country is inhabited by tribes absolutely savage, but not incapable, I believe, of being stirred up by alarm with respect to the lands upon which they depend for subsistence, and all of them are armed to a large extent. The case of the Masai you have recorded for you by your own officer, Sir Guildford Molesworth. The case of Uganda and its King is fully set out in the Reports of Captain Lugard, and from him you have nothing to expect, according to Captain Lugard, except determined opposition. On the north also, says Captain Lugard, there is a wave of onward Mahomedan progress. Another great tribe, called, I think, the Umyoro, lying next to it and hostile to Uganda, yet agrees with Uganda in its hostility to the English:

and it is a most singular thing that according to the Report of Captain Lugard, almost without exception, all these people who are at variance with one another are agreed in being hostile to the admission of the English. There is an exception, and I am going to mention it. There are strong religious influences at work—French Roman Catholic influences—and it appears that in this sphere of influence the East Africa Company takes upon itself to inform the French missionaries where they may go and where they may not go, and assumes over them a Governmental control. But they happen to be a very powerful body. There are two influences—Protestant and Roman Catholic—the Roman Catholic very large and the Protestant very small. Sharp rivalry between them. Protestants very willing to welcome the influence of the right hon. Gentleman, and hoping, doubtless, that it will be backed by arms; the Roman Catholics, who are the large majority, being very averse to it. This is the case: that while we are obliged to go upon presumptions, as information has not been placed in our hands, all these presumptions converge to show that what you have to expect from the mass of the population in this region of Africa is bitter, and, generally speaking, united hostility. But worse still: there is a greater danger even than that. What is this sphere of influence? This sphere of influence was carefully excluded from the purview of the Brussels Conference. What is this sphere of influence? What right does this sphere of influence invest you with? Does it invest the right hon. Gentleman with a juridical title to go into the country with several hundreds of men, including either 40 or any larger number of armed men, and to take all measures that may be requisite for taking a survey? On what title does he put that?

MR. GOSCHEN: Along the whole of the routes there are Treaties which have been made with the Chiefs which give us these rights.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: Show us these Treaties. If the forms of the Committee allowed it, there ought upon that simple admission to be a Motion

for the postponement of this Debate. Show me these Treaties. It is not so stated in your Papers. Are there Treaties with Masai?

MR. GOSCHEN: I cannot give you the names—I have not got them.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I have so far got the names, that I know these Masai are upon the route, and I know that Captain Lugard in his Report has expressly stated that it is totally useless to attempt any Treaty whatever with the Masai, and that you must put them down. In my opinion—I do not say voluntarily—but it is an act of real disrespect to the House to call upon them to enter upon this discussion without supplying them with this information, and it is aggravated, and very greatly aggravated, by a proceeding which I believe to be quite without precedent—namely, in a case of this kind, entirely novel, and foreign to our practice, and without the smallest sanction of Parliament, to take steps, as the Government have taken to direct the commencement of this survey, and incur responsibility connected with it before they submit a Motion to Parliament for granting the money. This is a most important question. You admit by the character of the messenger you sent into the country to make the survey that there is a risk of violence and military operations. Under what law are these military operations to be conducted? To whom is the honour of this country to be committed? What right have you to cast upon the East Africa Company the responsibility of conducting such proceedings? Why you see from the Report of Sir Guildford Molesworth that hostilities are to be looked upon as certain, and the only reply is that you must take sufficient force. If there is to be war, are there to be laws of war? Is this war to be conducted by arrangement? If there is to be excess on the part of British agents you have no power to punish it. If gross outrages are committed—and when passion is heated and strong you cannot assure they will not fall into serious errors—who is to punish them? If crime is committed in the course of the operations, as anticipated by Sir Guildford Molesworth, by British agents,

how are you to punish that crime, committed in the name of the Government, committed on behalf of the Government, and committed under the authority of a Vote of the House of Commons? How are you to punish that crime? I have a right to an answer to that question. If crime is committed by the natives under what law are they to be punished? They are to be punished by no law at all. They are to be punished in the name of philanthropy and benevolence by carrying anarchy into their country, by setting them, from this great centre of civilisation, the example of what must be illegality and probably will be cruelty, and this in a sphere of influence where you have expressly and absolutely disclaimed all authority over the natives. A speaker on the other side of the House said this sphere of influence must, by hook or crook, be converted into a real and effectual dependency of the British people, and made available for their enjoyment. Is the hon. Member aware it is an absolute breach of faith if any such thing be attempted? You are going to attempt it on the authority of this Vote. You are going to assume authority which, at the time the German Agreement was made, in the face of this House you expressly and solemnly disclaimed. Is that disputed? At the time that Agreement was produced I addressed the House upon it, and I attached to it a signification which my hon. Friend near me has given it to-night—namely, that it was an Agreement between certain European Powers, absolutely excluding each of them from any attempt to exercise authority within certain limits. I asked “Is it well and thoroughly understood that by this Agreement there is no disparagement whatever conveyed to any of the rights now enjoyed by the natives? These natives were masters of the country as much as we are masters of this country,” and I was assured by the Government of the day—I daresay the record is to be found—and others received similar assurances, that the rights of the natives were to remain absolutely unimpaired. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) has not stated that the Treaties which he says have been made, but which he has not been able to produce,

authorise us to send armed forces into the country. I have shown that, as regards Masai, it could not be so, and, in fact, that we must act in the name of something still higher than law—namely humanity—going to trample law under our feet, and to introduce into that country what may be a plague and a curse, and what we have no right to send into that country at all, because as a civilised Power we are bound by the general principles of justice and humanity, and we have no right to act otherwise in dealing with uncivilised countries. My hon. Friend near me has gone through many of the points of the case upon which I will not endeavour to dwell. With regard to the Slave Trade; with regard to the cost of the railway—a very secondary matter, important in itself, but secondary in comparison with the other subjects before us; with regard to the nature of the labour by which the railway would have to be made—and there again Captain Lugard tells us there is no obtaining labour in Uganda except from the Chiefs and the Kings, and that there is no such thing as getting contracts with the natives themselves; with regard to the cruisers, as to which a vague and void hope has been held out without the smallest atom of proof—with regard to all these things the case of the Government is a perfect blank. I do not say it is impossible. I cannot tell. I do not pretend to possess the necessary knowledge for forming a final judgment upon this subject; but I say it is, in my opinion, the very height of rashness and of recklessness, in the absence of such knowledge, to incur such practical risks, and to perpetrate such violations of right as are necessarily involved in the assumptions of the right hon. Gentleman without any proper information to guide us, and for my part, in the present state of things, and without attempting to say what judgment would be arrived at had this matter been inquired into, as it ought to have been inquired into, by a Committee of this House, or by some competent authority responsible to us, I will wash my hands of all responsibility for such proceedings, which I believe to be probably without any parallel in the history of this or perhaps any other Administration.

(11.54.) MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Are we not going to have an answer from some hon. Gentleman opposite? In regard to one matter I can give an answer. I received an intimation the other day from the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that if I applied at No. 2, Pall Mall East, I should receive an answer to certain questions. The next day I did receive a letter from the secretary of this company. Now, the right hon. Gentleman has asked respecting the financial position of the company at the present moment, and I have here a statement about it. The subscribed capital is £552,140, in shares of £20 each, of which £12 are paid. Two-tenths have been expended in making treaties and securing the territory for the British sphere of influence. One-tenth has been expended in administration charges; three-tenths uncalled; capital in hand four-tenths, represented by assets. The company was at its outset engaged in assuring the footing in the interior which enabled the British Government to secure a favourable settlement with Germany and Italy as to the sphere of influence, and they have since been occupied in explorations and in negotiations with chiefs, which have placed Uganda under the sphere of British influence and control. These operations had prevented its entering on any trade whatever. Mark, it has not traded at all, and the earnings of the company have in great part been confined to customs receipts, which, however, showed very considerable vitality and power of increase. The gross income in excess of customs during 1891 had reached £6,000 over the agreed yearly payment for the whole concession. Now, Sir, when a charter is given a very remarkable process takes place. Any gentleman can ask for a charter. They apply to a Committee of the Council, I think it is called. [An hon. MEMBER: Divide!] If hon. Gentlemen think they are going to get the Vote, I would point out that the First Lord of the Treasury told us this evening that he is taking private Members' days because he anticipated considerable discussion on the Supplementary Estimates, and so far as I am

concerned I am not going to do anything that would prevent the prophecy of the right hon. Gentleman coming true. We want details. We are sick and tired of right hon. Gentlemen opposite giving us no sort of information, and depending on the inarticulate cries of their supporters to put an end to the Debates. We consider this a most important question. We have had one speech from the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs introducing this matter, and we have had another from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader on this side of the House has asked a series of questions. They are addressed to Her Majesty's Government, but I also think they are as fairly addressed to the directors of this very remarkable company. Those directors I think have acted with gross unfairness to Her Majesty's Government if they did not give them the Report of Captain Lugard, or if in giving that Report to the Chancellor of the Exchequer they put "private and confidential" upon it. I understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was on his copy, and therefore he was unable to submit that Report to the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Midlothian has asked specifically whether we are going to have that Report. Sir, I tell right hon. Gentlemen opposite that they will not evade that Report getting to the public. It is in the hands of Gentlemen on this side of the House, and there are in this country Liberal newspapers, and therefore I strongly recommend some director of the company to get up in his place and allow the right hon. Gentleman to submit it to the House of Commons, and let us distinctly know what Captain Lugard did report. Captain Lugard was an officer, as I understand it, in Her Majesty's Service. He was not on half-pay. He is receiving pay from the Government, and he was sent out by this company. He is therefore responsible not only to this company, but to this House and to the Government; yet, although they had a Report from him a year ago—privately and confidentially communicated to the Chancellor of the Exchequer—they now come forward and want to slip this Vote



through the House, and it is only thanks to my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby that this was prevented.

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow, at Two of the clock.

Committee also report Progress; to sit again to-morrow, at Two of the clock.

#### FEE GRANT (SCOTLAND).

#### EDUCATION AND LOCAL TAXATION RELIEF (SCOTLAND).

Resolution [29th February] (see page 1575) reported, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 208.]

#### MILITARY LANDS CONSOLIDATION BILL.—(No. 184.)

##### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE, Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I hope the House will allow the Second Reading to be taken now. It is a purely consolidation Bill, and we propose that it should be sent to a Committee upstairs to examine it and see that the object is carried out by the details.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central): I ask the right hon. Gentleman to postpone the Bill until he can give me an answer to the communication I have made to him.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

#### PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL. (No. 95.)

##### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. KNOWLES (Salford, W.): I hope the House will take the Second Reading on the understanding that the Bill shall be sent to a Select Committee. The object of the Bill will be found clearly stated on the back.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee.

*Mr. Labouchere*

#### LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ALLOTMENTS BILL.—(No. 94.)

##### COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): It is with the assent of the Government, and I think most of the Conservative Members now present—many of whom I have spoken to—that I ask that the Committee stage may now be taken. I understood no objection would be taken.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): I hope this small measure will be allowed to go forward.

Clause 1 agreed to, without Amendment.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to, with Amendments.

##### New Clause—

(Power of Sanitary Authority to increase Plot.)

The Sanitary Authority may, subject to the same provisions and with the same powers as apply to the provision of the plot in the first instance, increase the plot attached to any existing cottage provided under the said Acts, but so, nevertheless, that the whole plot shall not exceed an acre.—(Mr. Know.)

Clause read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be added to the Bill." —(Dr. Tanner.)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I hope the Government will not object to giving the Sanitary Authorities the same power in relation to cottages already in existence as is by this Bill conferred for erections in the future, where a Board of Guardians may see fit to exercise it. I think it is not advisable to set up such a distinction between labourers as, without this clause, must exist.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. JACKSON, Leeds, N.): I am afraid it is quite impossible to agree to the proposal to apply this to the cottages already erected. There would be great difficulty in acquiring the land even if it were desirable to do so. So far as the Bill goes, I do not see there is any objection to the Sanitary Authority having the power to extend

the quantity of land to an acre in future, but I am not prepared to extend that power.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider whether it would be possible to allow the half acre to be added, even though it may not adjoin the existing plot? Would it not be possible for the Guardians to allow a division of the acre, half an acre being elsewhere but in the vicinity?

MR. JACKSON: I cannot give any pledge of the kind. I can see it would be extremely difficult to work a plan under which half the land might be at a considerable distance from the cottage.

DR. TANNER: I saw many instances last year to which this clause might, with great assistance to labourers, be applied. I hope it may be possible for the right hon. Gentleman on Report to agree to such a clause in some form.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): It is no uncommon thing in England to have allotment grounds at a considerable distance from the cottages, and I cannot see where the difficulty would arise in the present case. I quite admit it would be difficult to get possession of ground immediately adjoining a cottage, but it might be obtained within a reasonable distance. If the right hon. Gentleman can see nothing beyond a technical objection, I think it would be more gracious to undertake to consider the point.

MR. SEXTON: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will re-consider it, and whether it is wise to create two classes of allotments in this way.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported, as amended; to be considered to-morrow.

### MOTION.

#### TRUST INVESTMENT ACT (1889) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Oldroyd, Bill to amend "The Trust Investment Act, 1889," ordered to be brought in by Mr. Oldroyd, Lord Brooke, Mr. Gully, Sir Matthew White Ridley, and Mr. Rowntree.

Bill presented, and read first time. [Bill 207.]

#### TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

##### Return ordered—

In the following form, from each Trustee Savings Bank in the United Kingdom, showing the whole of the transactions which took place in the year ended the 20th day of November, 1891, as far as regards moneys placed in the hands of the Trustees of such Savings Banks for investment other than with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, pursuant to the 16th section of the Act 26 and 27 Vic. c. 87; also showing, at the 20th day of November, 1891, the liability of the Trustees of such Savings Banks to Depositors in respect of moneys received for investment pursuant to the said 16th section of the Act 26 and 27 Vic. c. 87, and the nature and amount, in detail, of all assets, including the reserve fund (if any) held to meet the same.

Return of Transactions pursuant to the 16th section of the Act 26 and 27 Vic. c. 87, and the Rule of the Savings Bank.

##### DEBTOR.

Uninvested Balance in hands of the Treasurer at 20th November, 1890. Sums received from Depositors for investment in the year ended 20th November, 1891. Interest received from Investments in the year ended 20th November, 1891. Sums received for Securities Sold or Paid off in the year ended 20th November, 1891, viz.:—Amount—Nature of Securities—Sums Received—Other Receipts (in detail).

##### CREDITOR.

Sums paid to Depositors in respect of Investments in year ended 20th November, 1891. Sums paid to Depositors for Interest on Investments in year ended 20th November, 1891. Sums paid for Management. Sums paid for Commission on Purchases and Sales of Securities, year ended 20th November, 1891. Sums paid for Securities bought in the year ended 20th November, 1891, viz.:—Amount—Nature of Securities—Sums Paid—Uninvested Balance in the hands of the Treasurer at the 20th November, 1891.

Liability to Depositors at the 20th day of November, 1891, in respect of Moneys received for Investment pursuant to the 16th section of the Act 26 and 27 Vic. c. 87.

Nature and Amount, in detail, of all Assets, including the Reserve Fund (if any) held to meet above Liability to Depositors, pursuant to the 16th section of the Act 26 and 27 Vic. c. 87:—Nature of Assets—Amount of Assets—Uninvested Balance in Treasurer's Hands.

We do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true account.

Witness our hand this day of 1891.

Two Trustees (or) Two Managers (or) a Trustee and a Manager of the said Savings Bank. Witness—Secretary or Actuary.

(In continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 94, of Session 1890-91.)—(Sir John Gorst.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

[No. 97.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

[INDEX.]



# INDEX

TO

## THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION).

### VOL. I. NEW (FOURTH) SERIES,

BEING THE

### FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1892.

#### EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| Bills, Read 1 <sup>a</sup> , 1 <sup>o</sup> , 2 <sup>a</sup> , 2 <sup>o</sup> , 3 <sup>a</sup> , 3 <sup>o</sup> , Read the First, Second, or Third Time. | com. Committed.       |
| 1R., 2R., 3R. Speech delivered on First, Second, or Third Reading.   | Dept. Department.     |
| Adj. Adjourned.  | Intro. Introduced.    |
| Admy. Admiralty.   | l. Lords.             |
| Amendt. Amendment.   | Obs. Observations.    |
| A., As. Answers.   | Q., Qs. Questions.    |
| Cols. Colonies.  | Re-com. Re-committed. |
| c. Commons.  | Rep. Reported.        |
| Com. Committee.  | R.P. Report Progress. |
|  | Reso. Resolution.     |
|  | Sec. Secretary.       |

The subjects of Debate, as far as possible, are classified under General Headings:—*e.g.*,  
 ARMY—BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—BOARD OF TRADE—COLONIES—EDUCATION—INDIA—  
 IRELAND—NAVY—PARLIAMENT—POST OFFICE—SCOTLAND, &c.

**A**bbotsbury Railway  
 Provisional Order Bill, 118

Aberdeen Postmaster — (see *POST OFFICE*)

ABRAHAM, Mr. William, *Glamorgan, Rhondda*  
 County Court Judges in Wales, 851

ABRAHAM, Mr. W., *Limerick, W.*  
 Fisheries (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, Intro. 165  
 Glin Board of Guardians, 876  
 Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners), 367

VOL. I. [NEW (FOURTH) SERIES]  
 [VOL. CCCLVII., O.S.]

Accidents on Railways  
 Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, 888  
 Returns of, 877

ACLAND, Mr. A. H. DYKE, *York, W.R., Rotherham*  
 Elementary Education (Schools receiving Special Grants) Return, 555  
 Pauper Relief Return, 821  
 Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1404, 1409  
 Teachers' Registration Bill, Intro. 827

ADDISON, Mr. J. E. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*  
 Established Church in Wales, 1079  
 Vexatious Indictments Acts, 1796  
 4 D

- Administration of Justice, Trinidad, 1491
- ADMIRALTY** (see *NAVY*)  
 First Lord of (see *Hamilton, Lord G. F.*)  
 Civil Lord of (see *Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. E.*)  
 Secretary to (see *Forwood, Mr. A. B.*)
- ADVOCATE, The Lord (see *Pearson, Sir C. J.*)
- Age Pensions (see *Greenwich Hospital*)
- "Agents Provocateurs" (see *Anarchist*)
- Agrarian Outrages (Ireland)  
 Returns presented [by Command], 555
- AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—**  
 (see *BOARD of AGRICULTURE*)
- Agricultural Holdings Bill** [c. No. 68]  
 Intro. Mr. Channing; read 1°, 163
- Agricultural Holdings (see *Small Agricultural Holdings*)  
 Notice of Bill, Mr. Chaplin, 42
- Agricultural Labourers, 11, 27, 49, 134
- Agricultural Labourers (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 69]  
 Intro. Mr. Tuite; Read 1°, 163
- Agricultural Produce and Parcel Post, 811
- Agricultural Tenants Improvements Bill** [c. No. 181]  
 Intro. Mr. Seale-Hayne; Read 1°, 827
- AINSLIE, Mr. W. G., *Lancashire, N. Lonsdale*  
 Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1431  
 Queen's Speech, Address, 145
- Albert University, 455  
 (see also *EDUCATION—Gresham University*)
- Aldermen as County Councillors, 189
- ALLISON, Mr. R. A., *Cumberland, Eskdale*  
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (England) Bill,  
 Intro. 167
- Allotments Acts of 1887, 896  
 Returns ordered (Mr. Channing), 1332
- AMBROSE, Mr. W., *Middlesex, Harrow*  
 Industrial and Provident Societies Bill, 801  
 [cont.]
- AMBROSE, Mr. W.—cont.  
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 753  
 Married Women Bill, Intro. 165  
 Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1428
- AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF**  
*Behring Sea Dispute*, 3, 23, 151, 382  
*British Convicts and U.S.*, Q. Mr. Gil  
 Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1494  
*Canada and U.S. Reciprocity*, 680  
*Chicago World's Fair Commission*, C  
 Lane, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1383; *Irish*  
*sentative*, Q. Sir T. Esmonde, A.  
 Gorst, 1793  
*M'Kinley Tariff and West Indies*, 870,  
 1787; *other States*, Q. Colonel H. Vi  
 A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1384  
*Washington Maritime Conference*, Q  
 Gourley, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 900
- "Anarchist" Prosecution  
 Q. Mr. C. Graham, A. Mr. Mat  
 697
- Anglo-Spanish Tariff*  
 Q. Mr. Schwann, A. Mr. J. W. Low  
 319
- Annuities under Congested Dist  
 Act, 186
- ANSTRUTHER, Mr. H. T., *St. And  
 etc.*  
 Steam Trawlers' Speed, 873
- Arabi Pasha, Removal of*  
 Q. Mr. C. Graham, A. Mr. J. W. Low  
 451
- Arbitration (International), 3, 24,  
 151, 1813
- Arbitration Act, 1889  
 Agreements in Scottish Contracts, 563
- Arboriculture, 1523, 1635
- Archdeaconry of Cornwall**  
 [L. No. 5]  
 Presented, Lord Mount-Edgumbe; Read  
 Read 2° and committed, 873  
 Committee reported, 1760
- Architects' Registration Bill**  
 [c. No. 204]  
 Intro. Mr. Atherley-Jones; Read 1°, 17
- ARGENTINA**  
*Financial Condition, and Naturalis  
 Laws*, Qs. Mr. Baumann, As. Mr. J.  
 Lowther, 1228

**Armenian Prisoners**

*Report in Daily News*, Q. Mr. Schwann, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 458

**ARMY** (see also **WAR OFFICE**)

*Allowances, Militia and Volunteer Artillery Officers*, 1615

*Appropriation Account*, 1890-91, Copy pres. with Report, 556

*Army Pensions*, Q. Major Rasch, A. Mr. E. Stanhope, 1208

*Artillery Ranges, Maplin Sands*, Q. Mr. Labouchere, A. Sir J. Gorst, 449

*Autumn Manœuvres*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Mr. E. Stanhope, 1615

*Balaclava Survivors*, Qs. Mr. Flynn, Dr. Tanner, A. Mr. E. Stanhope, 1381; Qs. Mr. O. V. Morgan, Mr. Mac Neill, Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1505; Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1625 (see also *Crimean*)

*Burma, Forces in*, Qs. Mr. Buchanan, As. Mr. Stanhope, 1621, Mr. Curzon, 1792

*Carlou Barracks*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1791

*Conditions of Service*, Q. Lord Wantage, A. Earl Brownlow, 174; *Report on*, Q. Sir H. Havelock-Allan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 455

*Contracts and Government Factories*, Qs. Col. H. Vincent, Capt. Bowles, As. Mr. Stanhope, 814; Qs. Mr. C. Graham, Capt. Bowles, Mr. Howard, A. Mr. Stanhope, 891

*Contracts for Socks*, Q. Mr. Logan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 677

*Crimean and Indian Mutiny Pensioners*, Q. Major Rasch, A. Mr. Stanhope, 461; Q. Mr. Leon, A. Mr. Stanhope, 811; Qs. Mr. Leng, Mr. A. O'Connor, Mr. E. Robertson, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1012

*Deferred Pensions, Chelsea Hospital*, 1208

*Dismissals, Mr. Jeffries*, Q. Mr. C. Graham, A. Mr. Stanhope, 680; *Mr. Shallard*, Q. Mr. C. Graham, A. Mr. Stanhope, 823; *Men at Enfield*, Q. Mr. J. Stuart, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1378

*Estimates*, 1892-3, Copy pres., 1000

*Government Clothing Factory*, Q. Mr. S. Buxton; A. Mr. Stanhope, 1238

*Henry Barrel Company*, Q. Mr. J. Rowlands, Capt. Bowles, As. Mr. Stanhope, 1016, 1515

*Magazine Rifle*, Q. Mr. Hanbury, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1634

*Military Leave (India)*, Q. Mr. Webb, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1512

*Militia Artillery Candidates*, 468

*Militia and Volunteer Artillery*, Q. Col. Hill, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1615

*Naval Artillery Volunteers*, Qs. Dr. Cameron, Sir H. Fletcher, As. Mr. Stanhope, 1025, 1629 (see also *Navy*)

*Norfolk Militia Training*, Q. Mr. S. Hoare, A. Mr. Stanhope, 822

*Ordnance Factories Appropriation Account*, Copy pres., 556

*Ordnance Factories, Overtime*, 824

[*cont.*]**ARMY—cont.**

*Ordnance Store Department Labourers*, Q. Col. Hughes, A. Mr. Stanhope, 671

*Pensioners and Reserve Men Employed*, Q. Mr. Hanbury, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1238

*Pouches and Belts Contract*, Q. Mr. J. Rowlands, A. Mr. Stanhope, 696

*Presbyterian Army Chaplains*, Q. Mr. Buchanan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1210

*Recruiting Committee's Report*, Q. Sir W. Barttelot, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1027 (see also 1223, 1516)

*Retirement Rules*, Q. Mr. A. O'Connor, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1515

*Rifle Ranges, Newtownards and Portmarnock*, Qs. Mr. Macartney, Mr. Clancy, As. Mr. Stanhope, 826

*Roberts, Lord, and Wantage Committee*, 1223

*Royal Irish Rifles, Training of*, Q. Mr. Johnston, A. Mr. Stanhope, 455

*Rural Postmen, Soldiers as*, 1794

*Signalling Instruction*, Q. Mr. O. V. Morgan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1800

*Small Arms Factory Prices*, 891

*Unclaimed Balances, Deceased Soldiers*, Q. Mr. Hanbury, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1233

*Unpensioned Veterans*, 461, 811, 1012, 1381, 1505

*Volunteer Commanding Officers*, Q. Col. Malcolm, A. Mr. Stanhope, 561

*Wantage's, Lord, Committee*, Qs. Viscount Curzon, Sir H. Havelock-Allan, As. Mr. Stanhope, 1223, 1516 (also 174, 455, 1027)

*Webster's, Sergt.-Major, Pension*, Q. Col. Nolan, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1012

*Woolwich Arsenal Labourers' Wages*, Q. Mr. Mather, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1621

*Woolwich Arsenal, Nightwork*, Qs. Col. H. Vincent, Mr. Mundella, A. Mr. Stanhope, 824

**Artificial Manures, &c. (Adulteration) Bill** [c. No. 127]

Intro. Mr. Channing; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 172

Ashbourne Act, 479, 486, 489

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Sheffield, Eccles-hall*

Greenwich Hospital, 1646

Haulbowline Dock, 816

Assessments of Property

Assimilation of Imperial and Local, 322

ATHERLEY-JONES, Mr. L., *Durham, N.W.*

Architects' Registration Bill, Intro. 1712

Employers' Liability Law Amendment Bill, 1712

Athlone Union

Erection of Labourers' Cottages, 890

ATTORNEY GENERAL (see WEBSTER, Sir R. E.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (see MADDEN, Right Hon. D. H.)

AUSTIN, Mr. J., *York, W.R., Osgold-cross*  
Goole Stamp Distributor, 1637

AUSTRALIA (see COLONIES)

BAIN, Sir James, *Whitehaven*  
Southampton Docks Bill, 1587  
Whitehaven Sanitary District, 1971

BAIRD, Mr. J. G. A., *Glasgow, Central*  
Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill, 1280  
Mining Accidents Insurance (Scotland) Bill, Intro., 554

Balaclava Six Hundred, 1381, 1625  
(Also see under *Army*)

BALFOUR, RIGHT HON. A. J. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Manchester, E.*

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums, &c.) Bill, 2R. 1604, 1608, 1609

Black Rod, 1526

Business of the House, 43, 907, 910, 1081, 1244, 1399, 1590, 1642, 1822 (see also Morning Sittings)

Church in Wales, The, 1109

Count Out, 908

County Court Judges in Wales, 856, 861

De Cobain, Mr., 43, 204, 1032, 1401

Diplomatic Vote, 1532

Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill 1315, 1447

Education Grants, Irish and Scotch, 570

Elementary Schools and Rates, 1797

"Equivalent Grant" to Scotland, 199, 1530

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1801

Financial Relations Committee, 1800

Goole Stamp Distributor, 1637

Gresham University Charter, 1244, 1531

Insurance of Children, 463

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 657

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Notice of Motion 42, 1R. 700, 746, 771, 777, A. 910

Morning Sittings, Notice of, 1639, 1801, 1808, 1810, 1815, 1818, 1821

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 1186

Private Bills Procedure (Ireland and Scotland), Notice, 42, for Leave, 1447

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1423, 1426, 1434, 1440, 1446

Queen's Speech, Address, 71

Rates, Division of, 1525

School Boards, Conduct of late, 1797

[cont.]

BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

Shop Hours Bill, 1181

Sittings of the House, 1642; see also Morning Sittings and Business of the House

State and Old Age Pensions, 202, 902

Supplementary Estimates, 1899

Supply—Civil Services, South Africa, 1833

Embassies, &c., Vote, 1822

National Teachers' Fund, 1556, 1561

Relief of Distress, Ireland, 1569

BALFOUR, Mr. Gerald W., *Leeds, Central*

Rating of Machinery Bill, Intro. 158

BALLANTINE, Mr. W. H. W., *Coventry*

Espionage Sentence on Bedwell, 1024

Vaccination Prosecutions, Suspension, 1498

Ballot Act, Illiterate Voters, 797, 863

Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill [c. No. 189]

Intro. Col. Waring; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1128

BANES, Major G. E., *West Ham, S.*

Churchwardens and Overseers, 694

Banking Reserve (see Currency)

Bank of England

Applications for Advances to Government, 664

Bankruptcies and Arrangements Bill [c. No. 150]

Intro. Mr. Chance; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

Bann and Barrow Drainage, 452, 815

BARRINGTON, Viscount

Medina Tunnel Bill, 2R. 872

BARTLEY, Mr. G. C. T., *Islington, N.*

Business of the House, 1820

Gresham University Charter, 1244

Income Tax Special Commissionership, 567

Lighting the Library, 566

Occupying Tenants' Enfranchisement Bill, Intro. 323

Old Age Provident Pensions Bill, Intro. 162

Outdoor Provident Relief Bill, Intro. 172

South Kensington Museum Designs, 566

BARTON, Mr. D. P., *Armagh, Mid*

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1685

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 622, 696

Queen's Speech, on Amendment, 497

**BARTTELOT, Right Hon. Sir W. B.,**  
*Sussex, North West*

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1528  
Recruiting Committee's Report, 1027

**BAUMANN, Mr. A. A., Peckham**

Argentina, Financial Condition, 1228  
Brazil and Argentine, Naturalisation in, 1228  
Fleet Street Post Office, 1632  
Justices of the Peace Bill, Amendment, 608  
Shop Hours Bill, 1135

**BEACH, RIGHT HON. SIR M. E. HICKS**  
(President of the Board of Trade),  
*Bristol, W.*

Death of James Chard (Choules), 180, 898  
Fish Landed at Brixham, 670  
Fogs and Deaths from Drowning, 194  
Foreign Tariffs, 180  
Holywood Pier, Co. Down, 817  
Irish Cattle Truck Rates, 671  
Level Crossings, L. & Y. Railway, 888  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 1188  
Naval Gun Practice, Plymouth, 689  
Overcrowding on Railways, 898, 1390  
Overloading Prosecutions, 1239  
Patent Office Surplus, 560  
Queen's Speech, Address, 109  
Railway Accidents Return, 877  
Railway Rates and Charges Provisional Orders, 118, 119, 1024  
Railway Servants' Hours, 570; Select Committee, 574  
Railway Station Names, 674  
St. Catherine's Lighthouse, 321  
Sale of Frozen Meat, 1799  
Saving Life at Sea, Decoration for, 558  
Scottish Pier Works, Form of Agreements, 563  
Scottish Railways, 1500  
Ships' Lights, 1501  
Steamer "Sir Walter Raleigh," 1517  
Trades Unions, Report on, 193  
Tunnel Railways, London, 1233  
Washington Maritime Conference, 900  
Wrecks on Glamorgan Coast, 1367

*Bedwell's, Mr., Sentence*

Q. Mr. Ballantine, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1025

**Beer Adulteration Bill** [c. No. 113].  
Intro. Col. Kenyon-Slaney; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 170

**Beer Adulteration (No. 2.) Bill**  
[c. No. 167]

Intro. Mr. Quilter; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

**Behring Sea**, 3, 23, 151, 382

**Belfast City Central Station and Railways Bill**

Debated, and Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1333

**Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums, &c.) Bill**

Debated, 1334; Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1362  
Committed to Select Committee; Instruction proposed, 1491  
Adjourned Debate, 1587

**Belfast, East, Representation of**

Petition, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Johnston, 117

*Betting and Gambling Laws*

Q. Mr. Morton, A. Mr. Matthews, 196

**Betting and Loans (Infants) Bill**  
[l. No. 13]

Presented, Lord Herschell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 413,  
Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1001  
Committee reported, 1200  
Read 3<sup>o</sup>, and passed, 1465

**Betting in Streets of Belfast**, 567

**BIGWOOD, Mr. J., Middlesex, Brentford**

Delay in Letter Deliveries, 1632

**Billingborough Crown Lands**

Allotments granted, 826

**BIRKBECK, Sir Edward, Norfolk, E.**

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, London, 181, 185, 1527  
Labourers' Cottages Gardens Bill, Intro. 297  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1433, 1434

**BIRRELL, Mr. A., Fife, W.**

Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill, 1231

**Bishops' Authority Regulation Bill**  
[c. No. 149]

Intro. Colonel Sandys; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 299

"Black Man," 91, 397

*Black Rod, Yeoman Usher of*

Q. Mr. Labouchere, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1526

**BLANE, Mr. A., Armagh, S.**

Armagh Guardians and Bann Drainage, 815  
Armagh Prison, 1376

[cont.]



**BLANE, Mr. A.—cont.**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1360, 1602  
 Clougher Quarter Sessions, 815  
 Morning Sittings, 1818  
 Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 637, 1184  
 Receivership under Land Judges, 904, 1027

**BLUNDELL, Colonel H. B. H., Lancashire, S.W., Ince**

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1419  
 Street Pavement, 1789

**BOARD OF AGRICULTURE**

President (see *Chaplin, Right Hon. H.*)

*Agricultural Produce by Parcel Post*, Q. Sir E. Grey, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 811

*Agricultural Returns*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Mr. Chaplin, 686; Q. Mr. O'Kelly, A. Mr. Chaplin, 1229

*Allotments Act, 1887*, Qs. Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, A. Mr. Ritchie, 896

*Artificial Manures, &c. (Adulteration) Bill*, 1 R. 172

*Cattle Disease*, Qs. Earl De La Warr, Marquess of Huntly, Obs. Earl Cadogan, 869

*Corn Prices, 1891, Tables of*, 1187

*Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Mr. Chaplin, 822

**Foot-and-Mouth Disease :**

*London*, Qs. Mr. Picton, Sir E. Birkbeck, Mr. Channing, Mr. Jeffreys, A. Mr. Chaplin, 181

*Ireland*, Q. Colonel Waring, A. Sir E. Birkbeck, 188

*Kent*, Qs. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Picton, A. Mr. Chaplin, 465

*Precautions, Edinburgh and Ashurst*, Qs. Sir E. Birkbeck, Sir W. Barttelot, Sir U. K. Shuttleworth, A. Mr. Chaplin, 1528

*Sheppey*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Mr. Chaplin, 686

*Slaughter of Animals, Raw Hides*, Qs. Mr. Darling, Colonel Dawney, A. Mr. Chaplin, 905

*Forestry Committee and Board*, Q. Mr. Harrison, A. Mr. Chaplin, 1391

*Ordnance Survey Grievances*, Q. Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh, A. Mr. Chaplin, 878

*Ordnance Survey, Select Committee ordered*, 300

*Small Agricultural Holdings Bill*, 1R. 911

*Uncultivated Land in Great Britain*, Q. Mr. Gibbs, A. Mr. Chaplin, 1223

*Veterinary Department*, Q. Mr. Lawson, A. Mr. Chaplin, 1237

**BOARD OF TRADE**

President (see *Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks*)

Secretary (*Balfour of Burleigh, Lord*)

[cont.]

**BOARD OF TRADE—cont.**

*Cattle Truck Rates, Ireland*, Qs. Mr. Mahony, Colonel Waring, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 671

*Chard (Choules), Death of*, Q. Mr. Mundella, Mr. Channing, James, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 179, 898

*Fish Landed at Brizham*, Q. Mr. Mallock, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 670

*Fogs, and Deaths from Drowning (London Docks)*, Qs. Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. Schwann, Mr. H. Gardner, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 193

*Foreign Tariffs, Return of*, Q. Mr. Leng, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 180

*Gun Practice off Plymouth*, Q. Mr. Mildmay, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 689

*Hollywood Pier, Co. Down*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 817

*Level Crossings on Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 888

*Lighthouse, St. Catherine's, and ss. "Eider"*, Q. Mr. Lea, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 321

*Lights in the Red Sea*, 817

*Overcrowding on Railways*, Qs. Mr. J. Wilson, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 898, 1390

*Overloading Prosecutions*, Q. Mr. Staveley Hill; A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1239

*Patent Office Surplus*, Q. Mr. Leng, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 560

*Railway Accidents Return*, Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 877

*Railway Rates and Charges Provisional Orders*, 118, 119, Q. Mr. Tomlinson, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1024

*Railway Servants' Hours*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 569; *re-appointment of Select Committee*, 573

*Railway Station Names*, Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 673

*Report on Trade Unions*, Q. Mr. Howell, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 198

*Sale of Frozen Meat*, Q. Mr. S. Leighton, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1799

*Saving Life at Sea, Decorations for*, Q. Mr. Broadhurst, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 568

*Scottish Pier Works and Arbitration Act*, Q. Mr. Buchanan, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 563

*Scottish Railways Monopoly*, Q. Mr. Buchanan, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1500

*Ships' Lights*, Q. Mr. Morton, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1501

*Steamer "Sir Walter Raleigh," Disablement of*, Q. Mr. Deasy, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1517

*Trade Unions, Report on*, 193

*Tunnel Railways in London*, Q. Mr. T. H. Bolton, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1233

*Washington Maritime Conference*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 900

*Wrecks on Glamorgan Coasts*, Q. Mr. A. Williams, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 1367

**Boilers in Her Majesty's Ships**

Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Mr. Forwood, 683

**Boilers Inspection and Registration Bill [c. No. 56]**

Intro. Sir E. Lechmere; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162

**BOLTON, Mr. T. H., St. Pancras, N.**

Conveyancing and Law of Property Act (1861) Amendment Bill, Intro. 169; Second Reading, 553

Electric and Cable Railway Schemes, 1610

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1420

Queen's Speech, Address, 143

Shop Hours' Bill, 1156

Tunnel Railways in London, 1233

**BOARD, Mr. T. W., Greenwich**

Greenwich Hospital, 1643

**BORTHWICK, Sir A., Kensington, S.**

British Picture Gallery, 1493

London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1470, 1484, 1488

**BOULNOIS, Mr. E., Marylebone, E.**

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 1466

London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1484

Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway (Extension to London, &c.) Bill, 1772

**BOWLES, Captain H. F., Middlesex, Enfield**

Enfield Factory Reductions, 892

Henry Barrel Company, 1515

Private Firms and Enfield Factory Operations, 315

**BRAND, Hon. A. G., Cambridge, Wisbech**

Copyhold Acts Amendment Bill, Intro. 169

Bravery in Saving Life at Sea, Decorations for, 558

**BRAZIL**

Commercial Treaty with, Q. Mr. Schwann, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 823

Naturalisation Laws, Q. Mr. Baumann, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1228

Breslin John, 256, 281, 345

British Columbia, Colonisation in, 562

*British East Africa Company*

Qs. Mr. Buchanan, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Morton, As. Mr. Goschen, 1235, 1237; Q. Sir W. Harcourt, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1400; Qs. Mr. Labouchere, As. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1627, 1629

[cont.]

*British East Africa Company—cont.*

Supply—Vote for Railway Survey, 1836-1883

*British Pictures, Gallery for*

Negotiations with Mr. Tate, Q. Mr. Whitmore, A. Mr. Plunket, 446; Q. Sir A. Borthwick, A. Mr. Plunket, 1494

*British Vice Consul in Paris*

Q. Mr. Esslemont, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 813

*Brixham, Fish Landed at*

Differences in Value explained, 670

**BROADHURST, Mr. H., Nottingham, W.**

Queen's Speech, Address, 120

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays Bill, Intro. 161

Saving Life at Sea, Decorations for, 558

**BROOKFIELD, Mr. A. M., Sussex, Rye**

Fire Inquests Bill, Intro. 572

Hop Substitutes Bill, Intro. 554

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 958

**BROWNLOW, EARL (Under Secretary of State for War)**

Army Service Conditions, 174

**BRUCE, Lord Henry, Wilts, Chippenham**

Rural Labourers' Cottages Bill, Intro. 298

*Brushmakers' Strike in Sheffield*

Q. Mr. S. Buxton; A. Mr. Matthews, 462

**BRYCE, Mr. J., Aberdeen, S.**

Church of England in Wales, 1061

Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill, 1284

"Equivalent Grant" to Scotland, 199

Indian Census, 1774

Indian Military Expeditions, 1778

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 759

Queen's Speech, Address, 147

Supplementary Estimates, 696, 910

Supply—Victoria Nyanza Railway, 1855, 1859, 1864, 1865

Theological Tests, Scottish Universities, 814

**BUCHANAN, Mr. T. R., Edinburgh, W.**

British East Africa Company's Survey, 1235

Military Forces in Burma, 1621, 1792

Presbyterian Army Chaplains, 1209

Queen's Speech, Address, 150

Rights of Way (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 161

Scottish Contracts, 1508

[cont.]

BUCHANAN, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*

Scottish Piers, Works, and Arbitration, 563  
Scottish Railways, 1500  
Supply—Victoria Nyanza Railway, 1845,  
1849

**Building Lands (Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 147]

Intro. Mr. Munro Ferguson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 322

**Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill**

Q. Sir John Kinloch; A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 318

**Burials Bill** [c. No. 75]

Intro. Mr. Osborne Morgan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164

BURMA (see *India*)

BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*

Employers' Liability Bill, Intro. 164

Business of the House (see *PARLIAMENT—House of Commons*)

BUXTON, Mr. S. C., *Tower Hamlets, Poplar*

Brushmakers' Strike, Sheffield, 462  
Business of the House, 1031  
Fogs, and Deaths from Drowning, 193  
Government Contracts, Wages, Return of Forms issued, 465  
Government Factory, Pimlico, 1238  
Loan and Ledger Paper Contract, 1785  
Queen's Speech, Address, 129  
Reuter's Telegram Company, 1516  
Shop Hours' Bill, 1152, 1169  
School Board for London, 1661  
Waterlow and Sons' Contract, 318

Cable Companies, Inland Wires, 1387

CADOGAN, EARL (Lord Privy Seal)

Cattle Disease, 869  
Police Protection in Ireland, 174

CALDWELL, Mr. J., *Glasgow, St. Rollox*

Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill, 1308  
Fee Grant (Scotland), 1575  
Glasgow and Edinburgh Post Offices, 565  
Scottish Education Code, 1229  
Scottish Prisons Report, 895  
Sheriff Courts Civil Code (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 168  
Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Extracts Bill, Intro. 171

**Cambridge University Jurisdiction Bill** [c. No. 103]

Intro. Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald; Read 1

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow, College*

Count Out, 908  
Education and Local Taxation, &c., 1289, 1315  
Feu Duties Rating Bill, Intro. 1187  
Financial Relations, England, Scotland, Ireland, 1017  
Glasgow and Edinburgh Post Offices, 1  
Isle of Man Mines and Factories, 1026  
Naval Artillery Volunteers, 1025  
Parochial Boards (Scotland) Bill, Intro.  
Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 167; 2R. 409, 1186  
Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill, Intro. 572  
Sheriff Substitute at Airdrie, 1220  
Telephone Exchanges, 1224

Campaigns in Crimea and India

Grant in Aid of Survivors, 461

CAMPBELL, Mr. H., *Fermanagh, &c.*

National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 166

CAMPBELL, Mr. J. A., *Glasgow, Aberdeen Universities*

Education and Local Taxation, &c. 1272

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Right Hon. *Stirling, &c.*

Education and Local Taxation, &c. 1251, 1269, 1315, 1398  
Private Bill Procedure Bill, 1244; on for Leave, 1454  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 144  
Scotch Education Grant, 571  
Scotch Equivalent Grant, 1530

CANADA

Colonisation in British Columbia, 56  
Emigration of Crofters to, 458  
Preferential Trading, 96, 107  
Reciprocity Trade with United States

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of

Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill 1009; 2R. 1713, 1730

*Cardiff Savings Bank*

Q. Mr. Howell; A. Mr. Goschen, 195

CAREW, Mr. J. L., *Kildare, N.*

Resident Magistrates in Ireland, 682

**Casualties (Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 171]Intro. Mr. R. Reid; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 664**Cathedral Churches Bill** [c. No. 146]Intro. Sir C. Dalrymple; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 299

Catholics of Ireland, 67, 79, 91, 212, 230, 372, 386, 476

**Cattle Disease** (also see *Foot-and-Mouth Disease*)

Qs. Earl De la Warr, Marquess of Huntly, Obs. Earl Cadogan, 869

Cattle Truck Rates, Ireland, 671

Caulkers in Royal Dockyards, 203

CAUSTON, Mr. R. K., *Southwark, W.*  
Millbank Prison Bill, 800

Cawood, Florence, Case of, 1632

Census Expenses, 1243

Census of Ireland, 1891

Part I. of Vol. 2 presented, 412

**CEYLON**

Abolition of Paddy Tax, 71, 201

**CHAMBERLAIN, Right Hon. J., Birmingham, W.**Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 755, 759  
Queen's Speech, Address, 209, 228**CHANCE, Mr. P. A., Kilkenny, S.**

Bankruptcies and Arrangements (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 323

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1355

County Courts in Ireland, 202

County Courts Bill, Intro. 171

Deeds of Arrangement in Ireland, 201

Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Bill, 166

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 657

Local Authorities (Acquisition of Land) Bill, 1329

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1425

Stamp Duties (Ireland), 320

**Chancery Suit Costs**

Q. Mr. Duncan, A. Sir R. Webster, 1234

**CHANNING, Mr. F. A., Northampton, E.**

Agricultural Holdings Bill, Intro. 163

Agricultural Returns, 685

**CHANNING, Mr. F. A.—cont.**

Allotments Act, 897

Artificial Manures, &amp;c. (Adulteration) Bill, Intro. 172

Enfield School Accommodation, 1492

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill, 822

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, London, 181, 686

Level Crossings, L. and Y. Railway, 888

Prisons Act Amendment Bill, Intro. 172

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1428

Railway Servants' Hours, 569, 576

Shop Hours Bill, Intro. 157

Vaccination Commission, 1498, 1782

**CHAPLIN, RIGHT HON. H. (President of the Board of Agriculture), Lincolnshire, Sleaford**

Agricultural Holdings, Notice of Bill to Facilitate Acquisition, 42

Agricultural Returns, 686, 1229

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill, 822

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, London, 182, 465, 686, 905, 1528

Forestry Committee and Board of Agriculture, 1391

Ordnance Survey, 878

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1R. 911, 931, 934, 936, 956, 962, 967

Uncultivated Land in Great Britain, 1223

Veterinary Department, 1237

Chard (Choules) James, Death of, 179, 898

**CHEYLESMORE, Lord**

Sat First 9th Feb, 5

**Chicago Exhibition** (see *America*)

Children, Cruelty to, 449, 899

Insurance of, 463

**CHILI, Civil War in**Shipment of Specie, H.M. *Espiègle*, 444**Chiltern Hundreds**

Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Goschen, 462

**Church of England in Wales**

Reso. and Debate, 1033

**Church Building Acts (Compulsory Powers Repeal) Bill** [c. No. 55]Intro. Mr. Powell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162**Churches and Sites (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 89]Intro. Mr. W. Corbet; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166

[cont.]

**Churchwardens and Overseers**

Q. Major Banes, A. Sir R. Webster, 694

**Civil Contingencies Fund, 1890-91**

Copy of Accounts ordered, 41

**Civil Bill Officers, Ireland, 682****Civil Service***Messengers, &c.* Q. Mr. Cremer, A. Sir John Gorst, 456*Indian Appointments, 577; Natives and Europeans, 819**Retirements and Age Limit, Qs. Mr. T. Healy, A. Mr. Goschen, 684, 1895***Civil Service Bank**

Q. Mr. Labouchere, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1626

**Civil Services and Revenue Departments**

Appropriation Account, 1890-91, 663

Estimates for 1892-3 pres. 663

Memo. on Estimates pres. 663

Supplementary Estimate pres. 808

**CLANCY, Mr. J. J., *Dublin Co., N.***

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1667, 1801

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 653

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 626

Rifle Range for Portmarnock, 826

**CLARENCE AND AVONDALE, the late**

Duke of, 3, 14, 22, 30, 37, 44, 51,

56, 72, 209, 375, 381

**CLARK, Dr. G. B., *Caithness***

Crofter Commission, 1497

Education and Local Taxation, &amp;c., Bill, 1274

Financial Relations Committee, 1017

Morning Sitzings, 1815

Sittings of the House, 1823

Supply Civil Services, South Africa, 1831, 1834

Embassies, 1325; Embassies and Missions Abroad, 1824, 1828, 1830

London Police Courts, 1318

National Teachers' Fund, 1554

**Clarke, Convict, Insanity of, 1524, 1790****CLARKE, Sir E. G. (Solicitor General), *Plymouth***

Church of England in Wales, 1042

**Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill [l. No. 19]**Presented, Archbishop of Canterbury; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1009Debated 1713, Read 2<sup>a</sup>, 1746**Clerks to Guardians**

Acting as Clerks to Justices, 1497

**Clogan Gold Mine**

Qs. Mr. T. Ellis, Mr. P. Morgan. Goschen, 678

**Clougher (Tyrone) Quarter Sessions, 815****Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill [c. No. 4]**Intro. Mr. Pritchard Morgan; Read 1<sup>a</sup>**Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill [c. No. 1]**Intro. Mr. David Thomas; Read 1<sup>a</sup>**COBB, Mr. H. P., *Warwick Rugby***

Allotments under 1887 Act, 896

Bailiff of Jersey and the Daniel Case, 449

Harlesden Postmaster, 1014

Influenza Epidemic, 190

Inland Revenue Officers' Petition, 1

Parish Councils, &amp;c., Bill, Intro. 16

Religious Freedom in Russia, 447

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 9

Usibepu, Restoration of, 446

Western Pacific, Orders in Council,

**COGHILL, Mr. D. H., *Newcastle Lyme***

Fintona Police Barracks, 1784

Forest Department, India, 444

High Sheriffs' Expenses, 1785

Queen's Speech, on Irish Amendment

School Teachers' Pensions, 1784

**Coinage Act, 1891**

Q. Mr. H. H. Fowler, A. Mr. Goschen, 1497

**Coinage, New Designs**

Q. Mr. E. Spencer; A. Mr. Goschen, 1497

**Collector-General of Rates, Dublin****COLLERY, Mr. B., *Sligo, N.***

Irish Railway Works stopped, 460

**Colliery Statistics, South Wales****COLLINGS, Mr. Jesse, *Birmingham Bordesley***

Footpaths Preservation Bill, Intro.

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 9

Small Holdings Bill, Intro. 322

**COLMAN, Mr. J. J., Norwich**

Clerks to Guardians and Magistrates, 1497

**COLOMB, Sir John C.R., Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.**

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 661

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 761

Shop Hours' Bill, 1176

## COLONIES

Secretary of State (see *Knutsford, Lord*)

Under Secretary (see *de Worms, Baron H.*)

*British Colonies and M'Kinley Tariff, Q.*

Colonel H. Vincent, A. Baron H. de Worms, 893 (see also *West Indies*)

*British Columbia, Q. Mr. Loder, A. Mr. Goschen, 562; Q. Mr. Seton-Karr, A. Mr. Goschen, 1020*

*Canada and United States Reciprocity, Q. Mr. Jennings, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 680*

*Ceylon Paddy Tax, 71; Q. Mr. Schwann, A. Baron H. de Worms, 201*

*Colonial and Indian Stamps, Sale of in London, 451*

*Colonial Reports Presented, 411*

*Colonisation Vote, 1020*

*Crown Agents, Appointments as, Q. Mr. S. Gedge, A. Baron H. de Worms, 441*

*Cyprus Legislative Council, Q. Mr. Picton, A. Baron H. de Worms, 1370*

*Falkland Islands, Q. Mr. Mac Neill, A. Baron H. de Worms, 676*

*Fiji, Judicial Commissioner in, 1369*

*Lagos Trade, Q. Sir W. Houldsworth, A. Baron H. de Worms, 820; Q. Mr. W. F. Lawrence, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1638*

*M'Kinley Tariff (see *British Colonies and West Indies*), 893, 1461, 1787*

*Natal Government, Q. Mr. Lawson; A. Sir J. Gorst, 1795*

*Newfoundland, 23, 32, 149, 382*

*New Zealand, Governor's Successor, Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Baron H. de Worms, 1393*

*South Australia, Northern Territory, Q. Mr. Watt, A. Baron H. de Worms, 877*

*Tariff Agreements (see *West Indies* below)*

*Trinidad, Administration of Justice, Q. Mr. A. Pease, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1491*

*Usibepu, Restoration of, Q. Mr. Cobb, A. Baron H. de Worms, 446*

*Western Pacific, Orders in Council, Q. Mr. Cobb; A. Baron H. de Worms, 1369*

*West Indies and M'Kinley Tariff, Q. Earl of Kimberley, A. Lord Knutsford, 870; Obs. Earl of Derby, Lord Knutsford, 1461; Q. Mr. Summers, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1787*

Commercial Treaty with Brazil, 823

## COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Lord President (see *Cranbrook, Viscount*)

Vice President (see *Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. H.*)

(see *EDUCATION Department*)

## Companies Act (1862) Amendment Bill [c. No. 105]

Intro. Sir W. Houldsworth; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169

**COMPTON, Earl, York, W.R., Barnsley**  
London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1482

## Compulsory Sale of Land (Ireland) Bill [c. No. 51]

Intro. Mr. A. O'Connor; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161

2R. Deferred, 1184

**CONDON, Mr. T. J., Tipperary, E.**  
Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 158; 2R. 613

*Congested Districts (Ireland) Board (see IRELAND—Land Acts, &c.)*

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts (1878 to 1890), 612

## Contempt of Court (Appeal) Bill [c. No. 190]

Intro. Mr. Warmington; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1128

## Contempt of Court (Ireland) Bill [c. No. 90]

Intro. Mr. Finucane; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166

Contracts for Army Socks

Comparative Prices in 1885 and 1891-2, 677

## Conveyancing and Law of Property Act (1881) Amendment Bill [c. No. 110]

Intro. Mr. T. H. Bolton; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169

Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 553

Committee, 662

Read 3<sup>o</sup>, and passed, 806

L. Read 1<sup>a</sup> [No. 17], 810

Debated, 1755; Read 2<sup>a</sup>, 1759, and com.

Convictions for Treason Felony

Numbers last 10 years, 879

## Convicts

*British and United States, Q. Mr. Gibbs, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1494*

*Outbreak at Wormwood Scrubs, Q. Mr. Pickersgill, A. Mr. Matthews, 197*

(See also *Daly and Egan, Gallagher, M'Kevitt, Mullett, Nally, &c.*)

**CONWAY, Mr. M., *Leitrim, N.***

Congested Districts Board, 895  
 Elementary Schools and Rates, 1797  
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 164

**CONYBEARE, Mr. C. A. V., *Cornwall, Camborne***

Census Expenditure, 1243  
 Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill, 1885  
 Morning Sittings, 1816  
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Intro. 159  
 Stationery Waste Paper Works, 1221

**COOKE, Mr. C. W. Radcliffe, *Newington, W.***

Queen's Speech (on Irish Amendment), 549

**Copyright Acts Amendment Bill [c. No. 106]**

Intro. Mr. Brand; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169

**CORBET, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow, E.***

Churches and Sites (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 166  
 Irish Lunatic Asylum Salaries, 317  
 Wicklow Mails, 446

**CORBETT, Mr. A. C., *Glasgow, Tradeston***

Shop Hours' Bill, 1142

**Cork Bankruptcy Court, 681****Corn Prices, 1891**

Statistical Tables (Sir M. H. Beach), 1187

**Coroners' Act (1887) Amendment Bill [c. No. 179]**

Intro. Sir Walter Foster; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 827

**Corporal Punishment Bill [c. No. 121]**

Intro. Mr. Milvain; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

**Corporate Associations (Property) Bill [c. No. 149]**

Intro. Mr. Howell; read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

**County Councils (see also *District Councils*)**

*Accounts and Stock*, Q. Mr. MacInnes, A. Mr. Ritchie, 1013  
*Aldermen as Councillors*, Q. Mr. MacInnes, A. Mr. Long, 189  
*Candidates*, Q. Earl of Kimberley, A. The Lord Chancellor, 1007; Q. Mr. Manfield, A. Sir R. Webster, 1030  
*Elections, Counting Votes*, Q. Mr. Labouchere, A. Mr. Matthews, 1530

[*cont.*]

**County Councils—cont.**

*Technical Instruction Grant*, Obs. 1  
 Cowper, Marquess of Huntly, Lord Nor Viscount Cranbrook, 418-431; Q. Lafone, A. Mr. Goschen, 452—*County Councils Grant*, Q. Mr. Hobhouse, A. Sir H. Dyke, 692—*Publication of Minutes*, Obs. Bishop of Salisbury, Viscount Cranbrook, 1463

**County Court Judges in Wales**

Resolution and Debate on, 827

**County Courts Bill [c. No. 122]**

Intro. Mr. Chance; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

**County Courts in Ireland, 202, 682****COURTNEY, Right Hon. L. H. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Cornwall, Bodmin* (See also under *SPEAKER*, for Rulings, &c.)**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylum) 1353, 1600

Electric and Cable Railway Schemes, 16  
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 780  
 London County Council (Tramways) 1479

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 805  
 Southampton Docks Bill, 1586  
 Supply—London Police Courts, 1318  
 Westminster (Parliament Street, &c.) Improvement Bill, 1770

**COVENTRY, Earl of**

A Lord Commissioner, 1

**COWPER, Earl**

Technical Instruction, 417

**COX, Mr. J. R., *Clare, E.***

Ennis Burial Ground, 1215  
 Outdoor Relief (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 164

**CRAIG, Mr. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne***

Inspection of Kitchen Boilers, 1387

**CRANBORNE, Viscount, *Lancashire, N. Darwen***

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1420, 1446  
 Shop Hours' Bill, 1154

**CRANBROOK, Viscount (Lord President of the Council)**

Technical Instruction, 426, 1463

**CRAWFORD, Mr. D., *Lanark, N.E.***

Education and Local Taxation, &c. 1270

[*cont.*]

**CRAWFORD, Mr. D.—cont.**

**Fees and Building Leases (Scotland) Bill,**  
Intro. 664

**Supply—Embassies, &c. Vote, 1923**

**CREMER, Mr. W. R., Shoreditch, Haggerston**

**Civil Service Messengers, &c. 456**

**London County Council Tramways Bill,**  
1485, 1486

**Morning Sittings, 1812, 1820**

**Postage of Polling Cards, 1992**

**CRILLY, Mr. D., Mayo, N.**

**School Teachers' Fees, Ireland, 698**

**Crimean, &c., Veterans, 461, 811, 1012,**  
1381

**Criminal Cases Appeals Bill [c. No.**  
163]

**Intro. Sir H. James ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572**

**Crofter Emigration, 459**

**Crofters' Commission, Decisions Over-**  
ruled, 1496

**CROSS, Hon. W. H., Liverpool, West**  
*Derby*

**Royal Niger Company, 1775**

**Summary Jurisdiction Act (1879) Amend-**  
ment Bill, Intro. 297, 1184

**CROSS, Viscount (Secretary of**  
State for India)

**A Lord Commissioner, 1**

**East India Officers Bill, Intro. 173 ; 2 R.**  
431 ; Com. 872, 1191

**Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill, Intro.**  
38 ; 2R. 431

**CROSSMAN, General Sir W., Portsmouth**

**Greenwich Age Pensions, 1375**

**Greenwich Hospital, Maintenance, 1371**

**Crown Agents for Colonies, 441**

**Crown Lands at Billingborough**

**Q. Sir W. Foster, A. Sir J. Gorst, 826**

**Cruelty to Children, 450**

**Currency, 59, 74, 385**

**CURZON, Hon. G. N. (Under Secre-**  
tary of State for India), *Lanca-*  
*shire, Southport*

**Bulwunt Rao of Indore, 1788**

**CURZON, Hon. G. N.—cont.**

**East India Company Pensions, 1499**

**Factory Act in India, 812**

**Forest Department, India, 444**

**Indian Civil Service Appointments, 466, 577,**  
579, 819, 825, 896, 1028

**Indian Civil Service Salaries Return, 1795**

**Madras Famine, 1495**

**Metre Gauge Railways, 1514**

**Military Forces in Burma, 1793**

**Opium Consumption in India, 1209**

**Opium Cultivation in Bengal, 1205**

**Opium Trade in Bombay, 185**

**Queen's Speech, Address, 88, 400**

**CURZON, Viscount, Bucks, Wycombe**

**Fire Brigades (Exemption from Jury Ser-**  
vice Bill), Intro. 161

**Lord Wantage's Committee, 1223**

**Customs Officers**

**Q. Mr. Neville, A. Mr. Goschen, 1515**

**CYPRUS, Elections for Council, 1369**

**DALRYMPLE, Sir C., Ipswich.**

**Cathedral Churches Bill, Intro. 299**

**Rights of Way (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill, Intro.**  
324

**Shop Hours Bill, 1179**

**Daly and Egan, 237, 242, 246, 277,**  
294, 329, 351, 365

**DARLING, Mr. C. J., Deptford**

**County Court Judges in Wales, 848**

**De Cobain, Mr., 208**

**Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 904**

**Queen's Speech, Address, 274**

**DARTMOUTH, Earl of**

**Sat First, 9th Feb., 5**

**DAWNAY, Colonel Hon. L. P., York,**  
*N.R., Thirsk*

**Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 905**

**Hares Bill, Intro. 170**

**Insurance of Children, 463**

**Deacons' (Church of England) Bill**  
[c. No. 137]

**Intro. Mr. S. Gedge ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 298**

**DEASY, Mr. J., Mayo, W.**

**Steamer " Sir Walter Raleigh," 1517**

**Deaths in Scottish Poorhouses, 1493**

[cont.]



**Deck Cargoes Bill** [c. No. 104]Intro. Mr. J. Stevenson ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169**DE COBAIN, Mr.**

To Attend in House, 43

Q. Mr. Sexton, A. First Lord of the Treasury, 43

Motion, First Lord of the Treasury, 204 ;  
Amendment Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir W.  
Harcourt, 206, Mr. Sexton, 207, Mr.  
Darling, 208**Deer Forests (Scotland) Return**, 317**Deficient Postage**, 903**DE LA WARR, Earl**

Cattle Disease, 369

**DENMAN, Lord**Duration of Speeches in House of Lords Bill,  
Presented, 1465Local Government Acts Repeal Bill, Pre-  
sented, 1465 ; 2R. 1578

Women's Suffrage Bill, Presented, 1465

**Department of Labour Bill** [c. No. 44]Intro. Mr. E. Spencer ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160**Depopulation of Rural Districts**, 10**DERBY, Earl of**

Colonies and M'Kinley Tariff, 1461

**DEVONSHIRE, Duke of**

Sat First, 9th Feb., 5

Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 37

**DE WORMS, RIGHT HON. BARON H.**  
(Under Secretary of State for the  
Colonies), *Liverpool, East Toxteth*

British Colonies and M'Kinley Tariff, 893

Crown Agents for Colonies, 441

Cyprus Legislative Council, 1370

Falkland Islands, 676

Lagos Trade, 820

New Zealand, Governor of, 1393

Paddy Tax in Ceylon, 201

South Australia, Northern Territory, 877

Usibepu, Restoration of, 446

Western Pacific, Orders in Council, 1369

**DICKSON, Mr. T. A., Dublin, St. Stephen's  
Green**

Tenure of Land (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 162

**DILLON, Mr. J., Mayo, E.**Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
2 R. 1359**DILLON, Mr. J.—cont.**

Business of the House, 907, 1322

Congested Districts Board, 1028

Convict Mullett's Health, 1217

Evicted Tenants and Land Purchase  
1386

Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, 166

Morning Sittings, 1815

Nally, the late Convict, 1380

Piers and Harbours (Ireland) Bill  
164

Public Meetings, 1520

Queen's Speech (Treason Felony P  
351

Relief Operations, Vote for, 1031

Salvation Army at Eastbourne, 102

Supply—Embassies Vote, 1223

Supply—National Teachers' Fund,

Supply—Relief of Distress, 1564

**DILLWYN, Mr. L. L., Swansea**

The Church in Wales, 1040

**Dishonesty of Officials**, Guai  
902**Dissentient Liberals**, 219, 517**Dissolution**, 375, 510**District Councils**, 63, 75, 121, 1**District Registries, England and**

Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Sir R. Webb

**Divorce Bill** [c. No. 123]Intro. Mr. Hunter ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171**DIXON-HARTLAND, Mr. F. D., Mil  
Uxbridge**

Late School Board's Conduct, 1796

London County Council (Tramway  
1473, 1475School Board for London, Motion  
1663Westminster (Parliament Street) Bill,  
2R. 1761**Dockyard Towns, Education in**,**Donegall, Marquess of**, 1398**DOUGLAS, RIGHT HON. A.**  
(Patronage Secretary to the  
Treasury), *Kent, St. Augustine's*  
New Writ moved for Belfast, E., 161  
Sasine Office Clerks, 1499**Drainage and Improvement of  
(Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 85]Intro. Mr. Chance ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166

[cont.]

*d Justices and Mr. Harrison*

Labouchere, A. Mr. Matthews, 568

19, Fogs, and Deaths from, 194

Registry of Deeds Office

n Making Searches, 818

; Earl of

s Speech, Address in Answer to, 6

Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*

ion Endowments (Banff) Bill, Intro.

Trawling, Scottish Coast, 873

x, Lord

Representative Peer for Ireland,  
Feb. 5

, Mr. J. A., *Barrow-in-Furness*

ry Suits, Costs, 1234

n of Speeches in House of  
eds Bill [*l.* No. 26]

ed, Lord Denman; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1465

g Houses, Re-letting (Scot-  
d) Bill [*c.* No. 157]

Mr. Provand; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 324

RIGHT HON. SIR W. HART  
ce President of the Council for  
ucation), *Kent, Dartford*

University, 455

School Accommodation, 1492

urgh Museum Clerks, 1214

ion in Dockyard Towns, 200

National Schoolboys, 1367

m University, 695

Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1405, 1413,  
1425, 1427, 1428

s Printer, Alterations by, 687

mentary School Grants, 1614

Books in Voluntary Schools, 317

and Art Examinations, 1508

cal Education and County Councils,

rne Improvement Act, 1885

utions for Open Air Services, &c.)

for Particulars of Charges, &c. 808

so *Salvation Army*)

dia Officers Bill [*l.* Nos. 10,  
21]

ed, Viscount Cross; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 173

<sup>a</sup>, 431

72, and Re-Com.

*Eat India Officers Bill—cont.*

Com. 1189, Division, 1200

Report, 1577; Amendts. reported, 1755

**Education and Local Taxation Relief  
(Scotland) Bill** [*c.* No. 208]

Intro. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1245

Debate adjourned, 1316

Order Discharged, 1447

Reso. in Com. "Fee Grant," 1575

Reso. Reported; Bill Intro. Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1883

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Lord President of the Council (see *Cranbrook, Viscount*)

Vice President (see *Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. Hart*)

(See also under IRELAND)

*Albert University*, Q. Mr. Roby, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 455

*Education in Dockyard Towns*, Qs. Mr. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 200

*Education Grants, Irish and Scotch*, Qs. Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, As. Mr. Balfour, 570

*Elementary Education Act, Printing of*, Qs. Mr. A. O'Connor, Mr. T. M. Healy, Dr. Cameron, As. Sir W. H. Dyke, Mr. Speaker, 687

*Enfield School Accommodation*, Q. Mr. Channing, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 1492

*Epsom National Schoolboys*, Q. Mr. Wallace, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 1367

*Gresham University*, Qs. Mr. Picton, Mr. Bartley, As. Sir W. H. Dyke, 695; Qs. Mr. Bartley, Mr. Mundella, As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1244, 1531

*London School Board*, Motion 1646, Counted out, 1664;—*Conduct of late Board*, Q. Mr. Dixon-Hartland, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1796

*Public Meetings in Schoolrooms*, Res. 1403

*Rating of Elementary Schools*, 1387, 1797

*School Books in Voluntary Schools*, Q. Mr. Paulton, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 316

*Secondary and Technical Education in London*, Q. Mr. Lafone, A. Mr. Goschen, 452

*Schools Receiving Grants*, Return of, 555

*Science and Art Examinations*, Q. Mr. Hobhouse, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 1509

*Supplementary School Grants*, Q. Mr. Maclure, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 1614

*Teachers' Superannuations*, Select Com. to be re-appointed, 555

*Technical Education and County Councils*, Obs. Earl Cowper, Marquess of Huntly, Lord Norton, Viscount Cranbrook, 417-426; Q. Mr. Lafone, A. Mr. Goschen, 452, Q. Mr. Hobhouse, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 691; Obs. Bishop of Salisbury, Viscount Cranbrook, 1462

[*cont.*]

[*cont.*]

**Educational Endowment (Banff) Bill** [c. No. 45]Intro. Mr. Duff ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160**Education (Scotland) (Code) 1892**

Code of Regulations, 1892, pres. 556

Egypt, 3, 14, 22, 31, 46, 213, 223, 226, 373, 381

**Eight Hours Bill** [c. No. 136]Intro. Mr. Cuninghame Graham ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 298**Electors' Qualification and Registration Bill** [c. No. 38]Intro. Mr. Stansfeld ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159**Electric and Cable Railway Schemes**Reso. for Joint Com., Mr. Whitmore, 1610  
c. Message from House of Lords, 1759**Elementary Schools and Local Rates, 1387, 1797****ELLIOT, Hon. H. F. H., Ayrshire, N.**Magistrates in Police Burghs (Scotland) Bill,  
Intro. 169**ELLIS, Mr. John E., Nottingham, Rushcliffe**

Hours of Railway Servants, Select Committee, 573

Parliamentary Debates Reports, 443

Post Office and Railway Companies, 881

Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 442 ; Rules for Periodical Returns, 700

Queen's Speech, 391

Railway Accidents Return, 876

Railway Telegrams, 1501

Salvation Army, Eastbourne, 1023

Savings Banks Act (1891), 189, 902

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 965

**ELLIS, Mr. T. E., Merionethshire**

Clogau Gold Mines, 678

County Court Judges in Wales, 863

Established Church in Wales, 1100

Justices of the Peace Bill, 603

Places of Worship (Sites) Bill, Intro. 298

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1431

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 946

Tenure of Land, Intro. 157

**Emigration of Crofters, 458****Employers' Liability, 55, 136, 145, 153, 392****Employers' Liability Bill** [c. NIntro. Mr. Burt ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164**Employers' Liability Law Amendment Bill** [c. No. 205]Intro. Mr. Atherley-Jones ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>,**Endowed Charities (Cambridge)**

Copy of Digest ordered (Mr. Brand),

**Enfield Factory (see ARMY)****Enfield School Accommodation,****"Equivalent Grant" to Scotlan****Erzeroum, Consulship at, 147, 14****ESMONDE, Sir T. G., Dublin Co.,**

Harold's Cross Post Office, 903

Irish Representative for Chicago Ex 1793

Telegraph Office, Ventry and Fenit, 1

Writ for County Wexford, 1618

**ESSLEMONT, Mr. P., Aberdeen, E.**

British Vice-Consul in Paris, 813

Education and Local Taxation (Sc Bill, 1286, 1316

Local Authorities (Acquisition of Lan 1390

Police and Public Health (Scotland 1774

Postal Arrangements, Mull and Oban

Postmaster at Aberdeen, 198

Returning Officers' Expenses (Scotlan Intro. 161

Shop Hours Bill, 1160

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 954

**Estimates, &c. (see different D ments, and SUPPLY)****EVANS, Mr. Francis H., Southam**

Southampton Docks Bill, 1584

**EVANS, Mr. Samuel T., Glam Mid**

County Court Judges in Wales, 838, 8

**Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bi No. 32]**Intro. Mr. O'Kelly ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158

2R. Debated, 1665

Put off for six months, 1711

**Evictions, Ireland, Returns of, 55 also under title of IRELAND Law and Police)**

**Evidence in Criminal Cases Bill**  
[1. No. 4]

Presented, Lord Chancellor; Read 1<sup>st</sup>, 38  
Second Reading, 665; Com., 872  
3R. deferred, 1200  
Order discharged, 1463  
Order Rescinded—Re-com. to Standing Com.  
1760

**Excise Officers Collecting Agricultural Returns, 1374**

**Explosions (Malago Vale Colliery)**  
Reports presented, 412

**FRYE, Colonel H., Lincolnshire, Gainsborough**  
Queen's Speech, Address, 85

**Factory Act, India, 812**

**Factory and Workshop Inspection, 123, 156, 193; Inspectors, Q. 690**

**Fair Trade, 96, 116, 550**

**FAULKLAND ISLANDS, 676**

**Famine Statistics, Madras, 1495**

**Farndale, Mr., 245, 281, 339**

**FARQUHARSON, Mr. H. R., Dorset, W.**  
Soldiers as Rural Postmen, 1794

**FARQUHARSON, Dr. R., Aberdeenshire, W.**  
Garve and Ullapool Railway, 1620  
International Sanitary Conference, 669

**Fenians, 239, 278, 333, 353, 357, 532**

**FENWICK, Mr. C., Northumberland, Wansbeck**

Shop Hours Bill, 1180, 1182  
Steam Engines (Persons in Charge) Bill,  
Intro. 169  
Trade Societies' Certificates, 1389

**FERGUSON, Mr. R. C. Munro, Leith, &c.**  
Building Lands (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 322  
Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill,  
1259  
Illegal Trawling, Scottish Waters, 874, 875  
Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 959

**FERGUSON, RIGHT HON. SIR JAMES**  
(Postmaster General), *Manchester, N.E.*

Delays in Delivery, 1632  
Farm Produce and Parcels Post, 811

**VOL. I. [NEW (FOURTH) SERIES]**  
[VOL. CCCLVII., O.S.]

**FERGUSON, Right Hon. Sir J.—cont.**

Forman's, Mr., Mission, 202  
Friendly Societies' Circulars, 1384  
"Germanic" Mails, 814  
Indian and Colonial Stamps, Sale of, 451  
Insufficiently Stamped Letters, 903

**Ireland**

Ashgrove, Post Office for, 882  
Bere Island, 1623  
Bushmills, 1795  
Castlecomer Postal Service, 1227  
Cork Mails, 682, 882, 1872  
Cushendun District delays, 1625  
Dublin Junction Railway, 894  
Harold's Cross Office, Closing of, 963  
Macroom District, 882  
Rathvilly, Telegraph for, 1792  
Salaries of Sub-Postmasters, 883  
Sorting Clerks, Dublin, 315  
Stranraer Mails, 188, 882, 1208  
Subsidies to Irish Railways, 561  
Sunday and Night Duty, Dublin, 1512  
Telegraph Stations, County Galway, 562  
Trippage Allowances, &c., 1623  
Upperchurch Sunday Post, 1519, 1635  
Ventry and Fenit Telegraphs, 1385  
Wexford Mails, 1522  
Wicklow Mails, 446  
Woodford and Whitegate Service, 1215,  
1522

Letter Cards, Profits on, 1496

**Officials**

Harlesden Postmaster, 1014  
Postal Officials Dismissed, 903  
Rural Postmen, 685; Pay, &c., 1218  
Soldiers as Rural Postmen, 1794  
Town Postmen as Stampers, &c. 1617  
Welsh-Speaking Postmasters, 1221  
Parcel Post and Agricultural Produce, 811  
Polling or Voting Cards, Postage of, 1392,  
1494, 1636  
Private Post Cards, 451  
Railway Companies' Telegrams, 881, 1501  
Re-addressed Letters, 692, 1242  
Registration Forms Postage, 1212

**Scotland**

Aberdeen Postmaster, 198  
Edinburgh Post Office Retirement, 1368  
Glasgow and Edinburgh Offices, 565,  
689  
Glasgow Postal Districts, 877  
Mull and Oban Service, 1370  
Scottish Mail Contracts, 1497  
Shetland Telegraph Cables, 1776

**Telegraphs**

Charges to Cable Companies, 1388  
Continental Telegraph Receipts 1366  
Guarantees against Cost, 692  
Railway Telegrams, 881, 1501

**FERGUSON**, Right Hon. Sir J.—*cont.*

Telegraph Clerks, Pay, &c., 887, 1226  
1636

Telegraph Money Orders, 1499  
Telephone Exchanges, 1224

**Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill**, 822

**Feu Duties Rating Bill** [c. No. 194]

Intro. Dr. Cameron; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1187

**Feus and Building Leases (Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 172]

Intro. Mr. D. Crawford; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 664;  
Withdrawn, and New Bill Intro. [No. 192];  
Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1128

**FIELD**, Admiral E., *Sussex, Eastbourne*

Canton, Outrage near, 1211

O'Halloran, Coastguard at Eastbourne, 1210

Salvation Army at Eastbourne, 1219

**FLIX**, Trials at, 1369

**Financial Relations (England, Scotland, and Ireland), Committee**,  
1017, 1800

**FINUCANE**, Mr. John, *Limerick, E.*

Contempt of Court (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 166

**Fire Brigades (Exemption from Jury) Bill** [c. No. 54]

Intro. Viscount Curzon; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161

**Fire Inquests Bill** [c. No. 164]

Intro. Mr. Brookfield; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

**First Commissioner of Works** — (see  
PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R.)

**Fisheries (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 74]

Intro. Mr. Conway; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 154

**Fisheries (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill**  
[c. No. 82]

Intro. Mr. Abraham; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

**Fishery Laws (Ireland) Amendment Bill** [c. No. 200]

Intro. Colonel Nolan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1576

**FITZGERALD**, Dr. James G., *Longford, S.*

Land Law (Ireland) Acts (1881 and 1887)  
Amendment Bill, Intro. 161

Queen's Speech, Address, 325, 539

**FITZGERALD**, Mr. R. U. Penrose, (*bridge*)

Cambridge University Jurisdiction Bill, 1  
168

**FLAVIN**, Mr. M., *Cork*

Gallagher, Dr. Thomas, 672, 1396

Queen's Speech, Address, 289

**FLETCHER**, Sir Henry T., *Sussex, L*

Naval Artillery Volunteers, 1629

**FLYNN**, Mr. James C., *Cork, N.*

Balaclava Survivors, 1881, 1625

Bantry Quarter Sessions, 1894

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums)  
1599

Birth Certificates, Cost of, 1019, 1232, 1

Constable Courtney, 1395

Haulbowline Dockyard, 1779

Intermediate Education, 1506

Kinsale Harbour Board, 1780

Lord Kenmare's Distraints, 1242

Members' Letters, 1242

Nally, the late Convict, 1378

Police Protection at Glashkinleen, 1018

Supply—Embassies Vote, 1325

Supply—National Teachers' Fund, 1565

Teachers' Pension Scheme, 1019

*Fogs*

Accidents in Dockyards, 883

Drownings in London Docks, 194

London.

*L.* Royal Commission asked for, 301-308

**Foot-and-Mouth Disease**, 181, 186,  
686, 904, 1527

**Footpaths Bill** [c. No. 158]

Intro. Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 554

**Footpaths Preservation Bill** [c.  
161]

Intro. Mr. Jesse Collings; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

**Foreign Goods (Mark of Origin)**  
[c. No. 130]

Intro. Col. H. Vincent; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 297

**Forest Department (India)**, 444

**Forestry Committee**, 1391

**Forman's**, Mr., Mission, 201

**FORWOOD**, Right Hon. A. B. (*retary to the Admiralty*), *La shire, Ormskirk*

Boilers in Her Majesty's Ships, 683

[*cont*]

**FORWOOD**, Right Hon. A. B.—*cont.*

Caulkers in Royal Dockyards, 204

Naval Reserve and Indian Marine, 693

**FOSTER**, Sir B. Walter, *Derby, Ilkeston*

Billingborough Crown Lands, 826

Coroners' Act (1887) Amendment Bill, Intro. 827

Pauper Relief Return, 821

Pensions (Old Age) Bill, Intro. 160

**FOWLER**, Right Hon. H. H., *Wolverhampton, E.*

Army and Navy Estimates, 1639

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1605

Coinage Act, 1891

**FRASER**, Lt.-General Sir Charles C., *Lambeth, N.*

London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1489

"Freeman's Journal," 219, 904

Froude, Mr., Quotation from, 92

*Frozen Meat, Sale of*

Q. Mr. S. Leighton, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 1799

**FRY**, Mr. Lewis, *Bristol, N.*

Consumption of Opium in India, 1209

**FURNESS**, Mr. C., *Hartlepool*

Tuberculosis, Royal Commission on, 1226

Gallagher, Dr., 253, 672, 1396

Gallery of British Pictures, Mr. Tate's, 446, 1494

Galway, Acreage required for Planting, 180

Gambling and Betting Laws, 196

**Gambling Act, 1845, Amendment Bill** [L. No. 23]

Presented, Lord Herschell; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1464

**GARDNER**, Mr. Herbert, *Essex, Saffron Walden*

Fogs and Loss of Life, 194

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1403, 1425, 1439

Garibaldi, 347

**GATHORNE-HARDY**, Hon. A. E., *Sussex, East Grinstead*

Justices of the Peace Bill, 607

**GEDGE**, Mr. Sydney, *Stockport*

Crown Agents for Colonies, 441

Deacons (Church of England) Bill, Intro. 298

Shop Hours Bill, Amendment, 1138, 1160

**General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act (1862) Amendment Bill** [c. No. 188]

Intro. Mr. J. P. Smith; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1127

*German Emigrants*

Q. Mr. C. Wilson, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1633

**GIBBS**, Mr. H. Hucks, *London*

Uncultivated Land in Great Britain, 1222

United States and British Convicts, 1494

**GILES**, Mr. A., *Southampton*

Westminster (Parliament Street) Improvement Bill, 1763

**GILHOOLY**, Mr. J., *Cork, Co., W.*

Bere Island Post, 1623

Fair Rent Appeals, 1519

Kerry County Cess, 1783

Public Meetings, 1520

**GLADSTONE**, Right Hon. W. E., *Edinburgh, Midlothian*

Business of the House—Morning Sitings, 1804

Supply—Victoria Nyanza Railway, 1668

**Glebe Lands (Sales)**

Return ordered (Mr. S. Lefevre) 806, pres. 1712

**Gold Mining Royalties** (also see Clogan)

Q. Mr. Pritchard Morgan, A. Mr. Goschen, 823

**Goole Stamp Distributor**, 1637

**GORST**, RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN E. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Chatham*

Annuities, Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Act, 187

Arboriculture, 1524

Artillery Ranges, Maplin Sands, 449

Billingborough Crown Estate, 826

Cadastral Survey for India, 1775

Carloway Pier, 1526

Chicago World's Fair Commission, 1383, 1793

**GORST** Right Hon. Sir John E.—*cont.*

- Civil Contingencies Fund, 1890-91, Accounts, 41
- Civil Service Messengers, &c., 456
- Civil Service Bank, 1626
- Crown Lands Office, 1638
- Fee Grant (Scotland), 1575
- Income Tax Appeals, Ireland, 692
- Indian Census, 1775
- Indian Civil Service Appointments, 577
- Indian Military Expeditions, 1773
- Indian Relief Kitchens, 1774
- Irish Railways in Congested Districts, 460
- Irish Land Purchase, "Periodical Returns," 700
- Irish School Teachers' Pensions, 1784
- Kinsale Harbour Debt, 1507, 1780
- Lagos District, 1638
- Lough Erne Drainage Works, 187
- Loan and Ledger Paper Contract, 1785
- M'Kinley Tariff and West Indies, 1787
- Mail Contract, Portsmouth and Ryde, 41, 1576
- Millbank Prison Bill, Intro. 298; 2R. 798
- Natal Government, 1795
- Newcastle Harbour, County Down, 886, 1216, 1780
- North Park, Eltham, 1230
- Parliamentary Debates, 443, 884, 1227
- Parliamentary Debates, Copy of Contract Presented, 558
- Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, 818
- Reuter's Telegram Company, 1516
- Royal University of Ireland Income Tax, 1218
- Scottish Contracts, 1508
- Scottish Prisons Report, 895
- Shannon Drainage Inspection, 1239
- Stationery Office Circulars, 564
- Stationery Office, Waste Paper Department, 1022, 1222
- Supplementary Estimates, 696
- Supply—Civil Service, South Africa, 1831, 1832, 1834
- Supply—National Teachers' Fund, 1535, 1539, 1541, 1542, 1543, 1545, 1550, 1561
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Accounts, 42
- Trinidad Judgeship, 1491
- Waterlow and Sons' Contract, 197, 319
- West Highlands and Islands Report, 319

**GOSCHEN**, RIGHT HON. G. J. (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *St. George's, Hanover Square*  
 Agricultural Returns, Collection of, 1875  
 British East Africa Company's Survey, 1235  
 British Columbia Colonisation, 562; Vote for, 1020  
 Cardiff Savings Bank, 192  
 Chiltern Hundreds, Precedents, 462  
 Civil Servants over Sixty-five, 684, 1395  
 Cloghan Gold Mine, 678

[*cont.*]

**GOSCHEN**, Right Hon. G. J.—*cont.*

- Customs Officers, 1515
- Designs for New Coinage, Committee
- Financial Relations Committee, E. Scotland, and Ireland, 1017
- Income Tax Assessments, Schedule 1
- Income Tax Commissioner appointed
- Inland Revenue Officers' Petition, 815
- Irish Constabulary Pensions, 1889
- Labour Commission, Ladies on, 461
- Land Purchase Act (1885), Annuities
- Light Gold and Coinage Act, 570
- National Education (Ireland) Bill, 96
- Pensions and Superannuations, 1527
- Property Assessments, 322
- Royalties on Gold Mining, 678, 838
- Savings Banks Act (1891), 189, 902
- Stamp Duties, Ireland, 320
- Superannuation Acts Amendment Intro. 1127
- Supply—Victoria Nyanza Railway, 1863, 1875, 1877
- Technical Education, 452
- Trade Societies, Certificates, 1389

**GOURLEY**, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*

- Autumn Military Manœuvres, 1615
- Boilers in Her Majesty's Ships, 683
- H.M.S. Victoria, Stranding of, 187
- Naval Reserve and Indian Marine, 6
- Letter Cards, 1496
- Torpedo Vessels, 1614
- Washington Maritime Conference, 9

*Government Contracts*

- Hebbert & Co., Belts and Pouches, 6
- Holland and Hannen, 125, 128, 130
- Prices of Army Socks, 677
- Return of Forms Issued as to Wages
- War Office and Government Factory 892
- Waterlow and Sons, 197, 318

**Government Factories**

- Complaints by Private Firms, 314

**Government of Scotland Bill** [ 65]

- Intro. Mr. Hunter; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 163

**GOWER**, Mr. G. G. Leveson-, *Stoke Trent*

- Supply—Embassies, &c., Vote, 1836,

**GRAHAM**, Mr. R. Cuninghame, *L. N. W.*

- "Anarchist" Prosecution, 697
- Arabi Pasha, 450
- Eight Hours Bill, Intro. 298
- Jeffries, G. L., Dismissal of, 679

[*ce*]

**GRAHAM, Mr. R. C.—cont.**

Jobson, Mr., Case of, 680  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 791  
Queen's Speech, Address, 132  
Shallard, Mr., and Ordnance Dept., 823  
Small Arms Factory, Prices, 892  
Tobacco Corporation of Persia, 891

“Grand Old Man,” 221

**GRAY, Mr. C. W., Essex, Maldon**

Queen's Speech, Address, 118  
Shop Hours Bill, 1162  
Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 945

**Great Northern (Ireland) Railway**

Report of Inquiry (Sir M. H. Beach), 1187

**Green Street Court House** (see  
*IRELAND*), 453, 880, 1619

**Greenwich Hospital** (see *NAVY* also)

Accounts pres. to March 1891, 612  
Age Pensions, 555, 1644  
Select Com. Motion, Col. Hughes, 1643,  
Agreed to, 1646

**Gresham University** (see also *Albert*),  
695, 1244, 1531

**GREY, Sir E., Northumberland, Berwick**  
Farm Produce and Parcels Post, 811

**GRIMTHORPE, Lord**

Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, 1721,  
1741, 1745

**Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill**  
[c. No. 134]

Intro. Mr. Leng; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 296

**Guardians of the Poor (Qualification)  
Bill** [c. No. 84]

Intro. Mr. H. J. Wilson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

**Guardians of the Poor Qualification  
(No. 2) Bill** [c. No. 153]

Intro. Sir W. Plowden; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

**HALDANE, Mr. R. B., Haddington**

Local Authorities (Purchase of Land) Bill,  
Intro. 158  
Queen's Speech, Answer, 293  
Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 933, 943  
Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 806  
Women's Disabilities' Removal Bill, Intro.  
806

**HALSBURY, LORD** (Lord Chancellor)

Conveyancing and Law of Property Act  
(1881) Amendment Bill, 1757

[cont.]

**HALSBURY, Lord—cont.**

County Council Candidates, 1007  
Evidence in Criminal Cases Bill, Presented,  
38; Second Reading, 665  
Marriages Abroad Bill, Presented, 1760  
Public Authorities' Protection Bill, Pre-  
sented, 1760  
Queen's Speech, 1  
Short Titles Bill, Presented, 413, 1463  
Smoke Nuisance Abatement Bill, 178  
Statute Law Revision Bill, Presented, 1760  
Trusts Bill, Presented, 1189

**HAMILTON, RIGHT HON. LORD  
GEORGE F.** (First Lord of the  
Admiralty), *Middlesex, Ealing*

East African Slave Trade, 1225  
Estimates, 1639  
Fog Accidents in Dockyards, 883  
Greenwich Age Pensions, 1375  
Greenwich Hospital, Repairs, &c. 1372  
Haulbowline Docks, 900, 1225, 1779, 1792  
H.M.S. *Espergle*, Chilean Specie Shipment,  
445  
H.M.S. *Victoria*, Stranding of, 188  
Marines Harvesting, 1786  
Naval Repairs on Irish Stations, 1015  
O'Halloran, Coastguard at Eastbourne,  
1211  
Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, 191, 1617  
Torpedo Vessels, 1615

**HAMMOND, Mr. J., Carlow**

Dockyard Staff at Haulbowline, 1792

**HANBURY, Mr. R. W., Preston**

Magazine Rifle, 1634  
Pensioners, &c., Employed by War Office,  
1233  
Unclaimed Balances, Deceased Soldiers,  
1233

**Handloom Weaving (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 154]

Intro. Col. Saunderson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

**HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V.,  
Derby**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
1351, 1603  
Business of the House, 1031  
Count Out, 909  
County Court Judges in Wales, 860  
De Cobain, Mr., 206  
East Africa Company Papers, 1236  
Established Church in Wales, 1119  
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences Refused),  
Return Moved for, 544  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 744  
Morning Sitzings, 1809  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1422, 1427,  
1433, 1437, 1442, 1443

[cont.]



HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*

- Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 55 ;  
(Treason Felony Prisoners) 328, 352
- 'Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 925
- Supplementary Estimates, 1399

### Hares Bill [c. No. 111]

Intro. Col. Dawnay ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 170

HARLAND, Sir Edward J., *Belfast, N.*

- Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
1338, 1592

HARRINGTON, Mr. Timothy C., *Dublin,*  
*Harbour Division*

- Evicted Tenants and Land Purchase Act,  
1386
- Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners),  
337

HARRISON, Mr. H., *Tipperary, Mid.*

- Arboriculture in Ireland, 1636
- Forestry Committee and Board of Agri-  
culture, 1391
- Pensions to Irish Constabulary, 1388
- University Education (Ireland) Bill, Intro.  
162

Harrison, Mr., and Dronfield Justices

- Assault by Gamekeepers, Q. Mr. Labouchere,  
A. Mr. Matthews, 568

Haulbowline Dock, 815, 900, 1225,  
1779, 1792

HAVELOCK-ALLAN, Lt.-General Sir  
Henry M., *Durham, S.E.*

- Report on Army Service Terms, 455
- Wantage Committee, 1516

HAYDEN, Mr. L. P., *Leitrim, S.*

- Arboriculture, 1523
- Nally, the late Convict, 1381, 1777
- National Teachers' Fund, 1547

HAYNE, Mr. Charles Seale-, *Devon,*  
*Ashburton*

- 'Agricultural Tenants' Improvement Bill,  
Intro. 827
- Industrial and Provident Societies (Lease-  
hold Enfranchisement) Bill, Intro. 170 ;  
2R. 800
- Justices of the Peace Bill, Intro. 171 ; 2R.  
581
- Rural Postmen, 685
- Town Postmen and Stampers, 1616

HEALY, Mr. Maurice, *Cork*

- Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
Amendment, 1347
- 'Erasmus Smith Endowments, 1223

[*cont.*

HEALY, Mr. Maurice—*cont.*

- Irish Drainage Acts, 1029
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 618
- National Education (Ireland) Bill, 996
- Rating Law and Boards of Guardians, 12
- Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 808

HEALY, Mr. T. M., *Longford, N.*

- Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bi  
1342, 1354, 1362
- Chilian Papers asked for, 1322
- Chiltern Hundreds, Precedents, 463
- Civil Servants over Sixty-five, 684, 1395
- Congested Districts Boards, 464
- Cork Bankruptcy Court, 681
- Cork Mails, 681
- De Cobain, Mr., 204
- District Registries for Ireland, 890
- Education and Local Taxation Relief (So  
land), 1447
- Errors in Printing the Acts, 638
- Green Street Court House, Dublin, 454
- Irish Civil Bill Officers, 682
- Local Authorities (Acquisition of Land) Bi  
1329
- Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 711, 7  
747
- Millbank Prison Bill, 1328
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 2R. 64  
Com. 1186
- Nally, the late Convict, 1381
- National Education in Ireland, 1376
- National School Attendances, 1376
- Parliamentary Papers Distribution, 1125
- Police Courts Vote, 1319
- Post Office Subsidies to Railways, 561
- Private Bill Procedure Bill, 1456
- Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1425
- Queen's Speech, Address, 279 ; on Ir  
Amendment, 540
- Railway Servants' Hours, Select Com., 57
- Shannon Drainage Works Inspection, 12
- Sorting Clerks, Dublin Post Office, 315
- Salmon Fishery, Lord Ventry's, 1240
- Summary Jurisdiction Act Amendment B  
1185

HEATON, Mr. J. Henniker, *Canterbu*

- Cable Companies, Charges to, 1387
- Continental Telegraph Receipts, 1365
- Forman's, Mr., Mission, 201
- Indian and Colonial Stamps, Sale of, 451
- Insufficiently Stamped Letters, 908
- Lights in Red Sea, 816
- New Zealand, Governor of, 1393
- Parcel Post (United States and Gro  
Britain), Return Ordered, 300
- Postal Officials Dismissed, 902
- Private Post Cards, 451
- Re-direction of Foreign Letters, 692
- Telegraph Money Orders, 1499
- Telegraph Subsidies, 692

AGE, Right Hon. E., *Great Grimsby*  
 es of the Peace Bill, 606  
 hester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire  
 way (Extension to London) Bill,  
 2  
 mentary Elections (Votes of Seamen)  
 , 1127  
 e Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1410  
 Agricultural Holdings Bill, 951

ON-HODGE, Mr. R. T., *Lancashire*,  
*E.*

ument—Queen's Speech, Moving Ad-  
 in Answer to, 43 (see also Appendix  
 owing 166)

HELL, Lord

ag and Loans (Infants) Bill, Presented,  
 ; 2R. 1001  
 y Discipline (Immorality) Bill, 1742  
 yancing and Law of Property Act  
 51) Amendment Bill, 2R. 1755, 1759  
 nce in Criminal Cases Bill, 668  
 of Goods Bill, Presented, 1760

Sheriffs' Expenses, 1785

Colonel E. S., *Bristol*, S.  
 ia and Volunteer Artillery, 1615

Mr. A. Staveley, *Staffordshire*,  
*ingswinford*  
 oading Prosecutions, 1239

EY, Mr. B., *Worcestershire*, N.  
 ron Warrants Bill, Intro. 163

, Mr., S. *Norwich*  
 lk Militia Training, 822  
 e Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1434

USE, Mr., *Somerset*, E.  
 ce and Art Examinations, 1508  
 ical Instruction, Money for, 691  
 s' Registration Bill, Intro. 323

d and Hannen, 125, 128, 130

## OFFICE

ary of State (see *Matthews*, Right Hon.

Secretary of State (see *Wortley*, Mr.  
 3. *Stuart*)

rchist" Prosecution, 697  
 g and Gambling Laws, Q. Mr. Morton,  
 fr. Matthews, 196  
 d, Florence, Q. Mr. C. Wilson, A.  
 Matthews, 1632  
 i, Expenses of, Q. Mr. Conybeare, A.  
 S. Wortley, 1243

## HOME OFFICE—cont.

*Children, Cruelty to*, Q. Mr. Cobb, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 449; *Insurance of*, Q. Col.  
 Dawnay, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 463

*Convicts, Clarke*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 1524, 1790; *Gallagher*, Qs. Mr.  
 Flavin, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Sexton,  
 As. Mr. Matthews, 672, 1396; *M'Kevitt*, Q.  
 Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Matthews, 458

*Counting Votes at Elections*, Q. Mr. Labou-  
 chere, A. Mr. Matthews, 1590

*Daniel Case and Bailiff of Jersey*, Q. Mr.  
 Cobb, A. Mr. Matthews, 1375

*Dronfield Justices*, Q. Mr. Labouchere, A.  
 Mr. Matthews, 568

*Factory Inspectors*, Q. Sir H. James, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 690

*Illiterate Voters*, Q. Mr. Webster, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 691; see also 868

*Ill-Treatment of Child, Helston*, Q. Mr.  
 Norris, A. Mr. Matthews, 899

*Imprisonment for Debt*, Q. Mr. Labouchere,  
 A. Mr. Matthews, 1502

*Kitchen Boilers*, Q. Mr. Craig, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 1387

*Licensing of Theatres*, Q. Mr. Lawson, A.  
 Mr. Matthews, 695

*Mines and Factories, Isle of Man*, Q. Dr.  
 Cameron, A. Mr. Matthews, 1026

*Nunn, Thomas*, Q. Mr. Pickersgill, A. Mr.  
 Matthews, 442

*Open-Air Meetings*, Q. Mr. J. Rowlands, A.  
 Mr. Matthews, 1232

*Police Pensions, &c.* Q. Mr. F. S. Stevenson,  
 A. Mr. Matthews, 1786

*Political Prisoners, Portland*, Q. Mr. P.  
 O'Brien, A. Mr. Matthews, 1396 (see also  
*Convicts and Treason Felony*, under Title  
 of IRELAND)

*Prison Commissioners*, Q. Mr. Pickersgill,  
 A. Mr. Matthews, 198

*Prison Warders' Pay, &c.* Q. Sir J. Pease, A.  
 Mr. Matthews, 1213

*Salvation Army, Eastbourne*, Q. Mr. J. E.  
 Ellis, Mr. Dillon, A. Mr. Matthews, 1023;  
 Q. Admiral Field, A. Mr. Matthews, 1219

*South Wales Colliery Statistics*, Q. Mr. D.  
 Thomas, A. Mr. Matthews, 1388

*Treason Felony Prisoners*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien,  
 A. Mr. Matthews, 879

*Wall's, James, Sentence*, Q. Sir E. Reed, A.  
 Mr. Matthews, 673

*World's End Meetings*, Qs. Mr. J. Rowlands,  
 Mr. Whitmore, As. Mr. Matthews, 1529

*Wormwood Scrubbs Prison*, Q. Mr. Pickers-  
 gill, A. Mr. Matthews, 196

Home Rule, 19, 65, 69, 78, 92, 101,  
 217, 234, 296, 335, 374, 388, 474,  
 504, 517, 522, 532, 538, 542

## Hop Substitutes Bill [c. No. 159]

Intro. Mr. Brookfield; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 554

[cont.]

**Hospitals, &c. (Assistance from Rates)**  
Bill [c. No. 102]Intro. Mr. Mather; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 168**Hospital Grants, Dublin and Belfast,**  
448

"Hot Orangemen," 25

"Hottentots," 68, 91, 469

**HOULDSWORTH, Sir William H., Manchester, N.W.**Companies Act (1862) Amendment Bill,  
Intro. 169

Lagos Trade, 820

Mersey and Irwell (Pollution) Bill, 1365

**Hours of Labour, France***Women and Children*, Q. Mr. Maclean, A.  
Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1513**Hours of Railway Servants, 569**

Select Committee re-appointed, 573

**Housing of the Working Classes Bill**  
[c. No. 13]Intro. Mr. Tuite; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164**Housing of the Working Classes**  
**(Ireland) Bill [c. No. 59]**Intro. Mr. O'Keeffe; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162**HOWARD, Mr. J., Middlesex, Tottenham**

Small Arms Factories, Comparisons, 892

**HOWELL, Mr. G., Bethnal Green, N.E.**

Cardiff Savings Bank, 192

Corporate Associations (Property) Bill,  
Intro. 323

Justices of the Peace Bill, 585, 600

Parliamentary Elections (No. 2) Bill, Intro.  
166

Trade Unions, Board of Trade Report, 193

Trade Union Provident Funds Bill, Intro.  
572**HOZIER, Mr. J. H. C., Lanarkshire, S.**Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill,  
1268**HUGHES, Colonel E., Woolwich**Greenwich Hospital (Age Pensions) Return,  
555; Motion for Select Com. 1643

Labourers in Ordnance Store Dept., 671

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 960

**HUNTER, Mr. W. A., Aberdeen, N.**

Divorce Bill, Intro. 171

**HUNTER, Mr. W. A.—cont.**Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill,  
1298

Financial Relations Committee, 1800

Government of Scotland Bill, Intro. 163

**HUNTLY, Marquess of**

Cattle Disease, 869

Technical Instruction, 421

**ILLINGWORTH, Mr. A., Bradford, W.**

Queen's Speech, Address, 114

**Illiterate Voters, 691, 863****Ill-Treatment of Child at Helston, 899****Imperial Tobacco Corporation, Persia**

Q. Mr. C. Graham, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 891

**Income Tax, Special Commissioner,**  
567**INDIA**Secretary of State (see *Cross, Viscount*)Under Secretary of State (see *Curzon, Hon. G. N.*)*Bulwunt Rao's Death*, Q. Mr. Seymour  
Keay, A. Mr. Curzon, 1788*Cadastral Survey*, Q. Mr. Mac Neill, A.  
Sir J. Gorst, 1775*Census*, Q. Mr. Bryce, A. Sir J. Gorst,  
1774*Civil Service*, Queen's Speech, Amend-  
ment, 396; Address for Return, 577;  
*Number of Natives, &c.*, Qs. Mr. Mac  
Neill, Sir R. Temple, As. Mr. Curzon,  
819, 825, 895, 1028"East India (Salaries)" Return, Q. Mr.  
Keay, A. Mr. Curzon, 1794*Factory Act Regulations*, Q. Mr. Provand,  
A. Mr. Curzon, 812*Famine Kitchens*, Q. Mr. Mac Neill, A. Sir  
John Gorst, 1774*Forest Department*, Q. Mr. Coghill, A. Mr.  
Curzon, 444*Indian Councils*, 16, 28, 81, 87, 383, 396;  
*Act Amendment Bill*, 38, 413, 609; (No.  
2) Bill, 1187*Indian Marine and Naval Reserve*, 696*Madras Presidency Famine Statistics*,  
Q. Mr. Mac Neill, A. Mr. Curzon, 1496*Military Forces in Burma*, Qs. Mr.  
Buchanan, As. Mr. Curzon, 1621, 1792*Military Expeditions, Expenses*, Q. Mr.  
Bryce, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1773*Opium Trade*, 84, 139; Q. Mr. S. Smith,  
A. Mr. Curzon, 185; *Cultivation*, Q. Sir J.  
Pease, A. Mr. Curzon, 1206; *Consump-  
tion*, Q. Mr. L. Fry, A. Mr. Curzon,  
1209*Pensioners, East India Company*, Q. Mr.  
Sexton, A. Mr. Curzon, 1500*Railways, Metre Gauge*, Q. Mr. Maclean,  
A. Mr. Curzon, 1514

[cont.]

**Indian Councils Act (1861) Amendment Bill** [l. No. 3]Presented, Viscount Cross; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 38Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 413

Committee, 809

Read 3<sup>o</sup>, 873, and sent to Commons**Indian Councils Act (1861) Amendment (No. 2) Bill** [c. No. 193]Intro. Sir W. Plowden; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1187**Industrial and Provident Societies (Leasehold Enfranchisement) Bill** [c. No. 114]Intro. Mr. Seale-Hayne; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 170

Second Reading, 800

**Industrial School Lads and Strikes**, 462**Influenza Epidemic**

Qs. Col. Howard Vincent, Mr. Cobb, As. Mr. Long, 189, 190

**Inland Revenue Officers**

Q. Mr. Cobb, A. Mr. Goschen, 812

**Inspection Committee, Trustee Savings Banks**, 189**Insurance Fund**, 481, 484, 499, 507**Insurance of Children**

Q. Col. Dawney, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 463

**International Sanitary Conference, Venice**

Q. Dr. Farquharson, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 670

**Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 53]Intro. Mr. Johnston; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 163**Intoxicating Liquors (Licences Refused)**

Return for 1890 and 1891 asked for, 554

**IRELAND**Lord Lieutenant *Zetland*, *Earl of* Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (see *Jackson*, *Right Hon. W. L.*)Attorney General (see *Madden*, *Right Hon. D. H.*)**Army and Navy**

Carlou Barracks, 1791

Haulbowline Docks, 815, 900, 1779

Rifle Range at Newtownards, 826

Royal Irish Rifles' Training, 455

Sergeant Major Webster's Pension, 1012

[cont.]

**IRELAND—cont.****Education***Average Attendance at Schools*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Jackson, 1376*Erasmus Smith Endowments*, Q. Mr. Maurice Healy, A. Mr. Jackson, 1324*Grant, Distribution of*, Qs. Colonel Nolan, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Jackson, 454, 570*Intermediate Education, Examinations*, Qs. Mr. Flynn, As. Mr. Jackson, 1019, 1232, 1506*Model Schools and Capitation Grant*, Q. Mr. Johnston, A. Mr. Jackson, 1504*National Education Bill*, Notice, 43; Debate, 968; Q. Colonel Nolan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1232*Pension Scheme for Teachers*, Qs. Mr. Flynn, Colonel Nolan, As. Mr. Jackson, 1019, 1231; Debate in Supply, 1532-1564; Q. Mr. Coghill, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1784*Return*, Q. Mr. A. T. W. Russell, A. Mr. Jackson, 194, 458*School Teachers' Fees*, Q. Mr. Crilly, A. Mr. Jackson, 698**Fisheries***Bills Introduced*, Mr. Conway, 164; Mr. W. Abraham, 165; Colonel Nolan, 1576*Limerick Conservators*, Q. Mr. Mahony, A. Mr. Jackson, 1616*Lord Ventry's Fishery*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Madden, 1240*Salmon Fisheries Bill*, Mr. Macartney, Intro. 180; 2R. 801*Shannon, Inspection of*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1239*Stewart, Mr., of Horn Head*, 674*Trawling in Irish Waters*, Qs. Colonel Nolan, As. Mr. Jackson, 1383, 1510, 1618, 1790**Land Acts and Commission, Legislation, &c.***Congested Districts Act*, 1891, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Sir J. Gorst, 186*Congested Districts Board*, Qs. Colonel Nolan, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. T. W. Russell, As. Mr. Jackson, 464; Q. Mr. O'Kelly, A. Mr. Jackson, 819; Q. Mr. Conway, A. Mr. Jackson, 895; Qs. Mr. Sexton, Mr. A. O'Connor, A. Mr. Jackson, 1010; Qs. Mr. Mac Neill, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Johnston, As. Mr. Jackson, 1023*Judicial Rents*, Return presented, 412*Land Commission*, Qs. Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. W. Russell, As. Mr. Jackson, 203; *In Enniskillen*, Q. Mr. Jordan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1525*Land Purchase Act*, 1885, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Goschen, 186; *Acts 1885—1888*, Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Mr. Jackson, 442; *Advances*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 312; *Applications*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 459; *Evictions*, Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, A. Mr. Jackson, 818; Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Dillon, Mr. T. C. Harrington, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Jackson,

[cont.]

**IRELAND—Land Acts—cont.**

1885; *Fair Rents, Antrim*, Q. Mr. Pinkerton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1218; *Leaseholders', 1887, Act*, Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Madden, 1215; "*Periodical Returns*," Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Sir J. Gorst, 700; *Rules*, Q. Knox, Mr. Keay, A. Mr. Jackson, 1231, 1789

*Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland)*, Accounts presented, 42

**Landlord and Tenant**

*Division of Rates*, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1526

*Evicted Tenants and Land Purchase Act*, Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, A. Mr. Jackson, 818; Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Jackson, 1513

*Evicted Tenants' Bill*, Mr. O'Kelly, Intro. 158; 2R. 1665-1711

*Evictions, Return of*, 556; *Lord Ashbrook's Estate*, Q. Mr. Roche, A. Mr. Jackson, 566; *Philipstown*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Jackson, 1497

*Fair Rent Appeal*, Q. Mr. Gilhooly, A. Mr. Jackson, 1519

*Lord Kenmare and his Tenantry*, Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Madden, 1242, 1394

**Law and Police, &c.**

*Armagh Prison*, Q. Mr. Blane, A. Mr. Jackson, 1376

*Bankruptcies and Arrangements Bill*, Mr. Chance, Intro. 323; *Local Courts Bill*, Mr. McCartan, Intro. 572; Com. 1576

*Belfast Registry*, Qs. Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. M. Healy, As. Mr. Madden, 889

*Civil Bill Officers*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Madden, 682

*Clare Constabulary*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1782

*Clougher Sessions*, Q. Mr. Blane, A. Mr. Madden, 815

*Constables—Courtney*, Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Mr. Stanhope, 1395; *Gurry*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Jackson, 1503

*Constabulary Pensions*, Q. Mr. Harrison, A. Mr. Goschen, 1389

*Convicts—Clarke*, Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, As. Mr. Matthews, 1524, 1790; *Dr. Gallagher*, Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Matthews, 672, 1396; *Kinsella*, Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1624; *M'Kevitt*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Matthews, 458; *Mullett*, Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Jackson, 885; Qs. Mr. McCartan, Mr. Dillon, Colonel Nolan, As. Mr. Jackson, 1216; *Nally*, Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. Hayden, As. Mr. Jackson, 1378-1381; Qs. Mr. McCartan, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Jackson, Mr. Madden, 1518; Qs. Mr. Hayden, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. McCartan, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Jackson, Mr. Madden, 1777

*Cork Bankruptcy Court*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Madden, 681

[cont.]

**IRELAND—Law and Police—cont.**

*County Courts*, Bill, Mr. Chance, Intro.; Q. Mr. Chance, A. Mr. Madden, 202

*Deeds of Arrangement*, Q. Mr. Chance, A. Mr. Madden, 201

*Enniskillen Gaol*, Qs. Mr. Jordan, As. Mr. Jackson, 1396, 1524, 1681

*Fintona Police Barracks*, Q. Mr. Coghill, A. Mr. Jackson, 1784

*Grand Jury Act*, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Mr. Madden, 1511

*Jurors' Payment*, Q. Mr. O'Hanlon, A. Mr. Jackson; Qs. Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Lea, As. Mr. Jackson, 1206; *Expenses Bill*, Colonel Nolan, Intro. 171

*Kerry County Cess*, Q. Mr. Gilhooly, A. Mr. Jackson, 1784

*Montagu, Mrs., Arrest of*, Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, As. Mr. Jackson, 906, 1242

*Oyer and Terminer, Commission of*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1630

*Police Protection in Ireland*, Obs. Marquess of Londonderry, Earl Cadogan, Marquess of Salisbury, 174-178; *At Glashkinleen*, Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Mr. Jackson, 1018

*Receiverships, Captain O'Connor*, Q. Mr. Blane, A. Mr. Madden, 904

*Resident Magistrates*, Q. Mr. Carew, A. Mr. Jackson, 682

*Treason, Felony Convicts*, Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, As. Mr. Matthews, 879, 1226; *Gallagher and McCabe*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Mr. Matthews, 1511

**Local Government and Poor Law**

*Boards of Guardians, Glin*, Q. Mr. Abraham, A. Mr. Jackson, 876; *Mullingar*, Q. Mr. Tuite, A. Mr. Jackson, 1508

*Collector General of Rates, Dublin*, Qs. Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Jackson, Mr. Madden, 699

*Donegall, Marquess of*, Q. Dr. Tanner; A. Mr. Jackson, 1398

*Dundrum Lunatic Asylum*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1501

*Ennis Burial Ground*, Q. Cox, A. Mr. Jackson, 1215

*Kerry County Cess*, 1783

*Labourers' Cottages in Athlone*, Q. Mr. Donal Sullivan, A. Mr. Jackson, 890

*Labourers (Ireland) Acts*, Q. Mr. Tuite, A. Mr. Jackson, 1218

*Labourers (Ireland) Allotments Bill*, Q. Dr. Tanner, Intro. 167; 2R. 410; Com. 1460, 1684

*Limerick Lunatic Asylum*, Qs. Mr. O'Keeffe, Mr. W. Redmond, As. Mr. Jackson, 315

*Local Government Bill, Debate on 1R.* 700-798; Q. Mr. J. Morley, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 910; Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 1188; *Sanitary Rate*, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Mr. Jackson, 1500

*Lunatic Asylums—Governors' Lists*, Qs. Mr. O'Keeffe, Mr. W. Redmond, As. Mr. Jackson, 315; *Salaries*, Q. Mr. W. Corbet, A. Mr. Jackson, 317

[cont.]

**IRELAND—Local Government and Poor Law—cont.**

- Municipal Franchise Bill*, Mr. Condon, Intro. 158; 2R. 613-649; Com. 1186  
*Poor Law Unions, Ages*, Q. Mr. Mahony, A. Mr. Jackson, 1090  
*Poor Law Guardians Bill*, Mr. Webb, Intro. 162  
*Poor Law Amendment Bill*, Mr. Mahony, Intro. 1390; 2R. 1711  
*Public Health Acts Amendment Act*, 1890, Q. Mr. Jordan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1630  
*Rating Law and Boards of Guardians*, Q. Mr. M. Healy, A. Mr. Jackson, 1230

**Miscellaneous**

- Arboriculture*, Qs. Mr. Hayden, Mr. Harrison, As. Mr. Jackson, 1523, 1636  
*Belfast, East, Representation of*, Petition, 117  
*Belfast City Railways Bill*, 2R. 1333  
*Belfast Lunatic Asylums Bill*, 2R. 1334-1362  
*Belfast Registry, Absence of*, Qs. Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Madden, 890  
*Betting in Belfast Streets*, Qs. Colonel Waring, Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Madden, 567  
*Birth Certificate Charges*, Qs. Mr. Flynn, As. Mr. Jackson, 1019, 1232, 1517  
*Cattle Truck Rates*, Qs. Mr. Mahony, Colonel Waring, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 671  
*Census of Ireland*, Copy presented, 412  
*Dublin Registry of Deeds Office*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir J. Gorst, 818  
*Green Street Court House, Dublin*, Qs. Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Mr. Jackson, 453; Qs. Mr. M. J. Kenny, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. MacNeill, A. Mr. Jackson, 880; Qs. Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1619  
*High Sheriffs' Expenses*, Q. Mr. Coghill, A. Mr. Jackson, 1785  
*Hollywood Pier, County Down*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 817  
*Hospital Grants*, Q. Captain M'Calmont, A. Mr. Jackson, 448  
*Housing of Working Classes Bill*, Mr. O'Keeffe, Intro. 162  
*Income Tax Appeals*, Q. Mr. MacNeill, A. Sir J. Gorst, 692  
*Intoxicating Liquors Bill*, Mr. Johnston, Intro. 163  
*Kilkenny Coal Fields*, Q. Mr. Macdermott, A. Mr. Jackson, 1012  
*Lord Mayor, Title of*, Qs. Mr. Johnston, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, A. Mr. Matthews, 875  
*Pawnbrokers*, Qs. Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sexton, A. Mr. Madden, 200  
*Planting of Land in Galway*, Q. Colonel Nolan, A. Mr. Jackson, 180  
*Public Meetings*, Qs. Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. Dillon, Mr. P. J. O'Brien, As. Mr. Jackson, Mr. Madden, 1520

[cont.]

**IRELAND—Miscellaneous—cont.**

- Queen's Plates*, Q. Mr. O'Keeffe, A. Mr. Jackson, 885  
*Representative Peer*, 5  
*Royal University and Income Tax*, Q. Mr. A. O'Connor, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1218  
*Stamp Duties*, Q. Mr. Chance, A. Mr. Goschen, 320  
*Stewart, Mr. C. F., of Horn Head*, Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. A. O'Connor, A. Mr. Jackson, 674  
*Trees Bill*, Mr. Knox, Intro. 165  
*"Venables v. Peebles" Case*, 815  
*Wreck a Train, Attempt to*, Q. Mr. M. J. Kenny, A. Mr. Jackson, 1011

**Post Office (for details see title POST OFFICE)**

- Ashgrove, 882  
 Bere Island, 1623  
 Bushmills, 1795  
 Castlecomer Postal Service, 1227  
 Cork Mails, 681, 882, 1872  
 Cushendun Mails, 1625  
 Dublin General P.O. Night Duty, 1512  
 Dublin Junction Railway and Mails, 894  
 Harold's Cross, 903  
 Macroom District, 882  
 Rathvilly, Telegraph for, 1792  
 Salaries of Sub-Postmasters, 883  
 Sorting Clerks, Dublin, 315  
 Stranraer Mails, 188, 882, 1208  
 Subsidies to Irish Railways, 561  
 Sunday and Night Duty, Dublin, 1512  
 Telegraph Stations, Co. Galway, 562  
 Tipperary Posts, 1519, 1635  
 Trippage Allowances with Mails, 1623  
 Upperchurch Sunday Post, 1635  
 Ventry and Fenit Telegraphs, 1385  
 Wexford Mails, 1522  
 Wicklow Mails, 446  
 Woodford and Whitegate Service, 1215, 1522

**Public Works, Distress, Drainage, Navigation, &c.**

- Armagh Guardians and Bann Drainage*, Q. Mr. Blane, A. Mr. Jackson, 815  
*Barrow and Bann Drainage*, Qs. Mr. Leahy, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Macartney, As. Mr. Jackson, 452; *Obstructions*, Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1386;  
*River Bann*, Q. Mr. Pinkerton, A. Mr. Jackson, 1618  
*Claremorris and Collooney Railway*, Q. Mr. Jordan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1693  
*Drainage Acts*, Q. Mr. M. Healy, A. Mr. Madden, 1030  
*Garve and Ullapool Railway*, Qs. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1620  
*Glenties Railway, Construction of*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 817

[cont.]

**IRELAND—Public Works, Distress, Drainage, Navigation, &c.—cont.**

*Killibegs Harbour*, Q. Mr. Mac Neill, A. Mr. Jackson, 675

*Kinsale Harbour Board*, Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1780

*Listowel and Tarbert Light Railway*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Mr. Jackson, 1397

*Lough Erne Drainage Works*, Q. Mr. Knox, A. Sir John Gorst, 187

*Newcastle Harbour, Co. Down*, Qs. Mr. McCartan, Col. Waring, Dr. Tanner, A. Sir J. Gorst, 886; Qs. Mr. McCartan Mr. Johnston, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1216, 1780

*Piers and Harbours Bill*, Mr. Dillon, Intro. 164

*Planting of Land in Galway*, Q. Col. Nolan, A. Mr. Jackson, 180

*Railways, Irish*, Q. Mr. Colliery, A. Sir J. Gorst, 461

*Relief Operations Vote*, Q. Mr. Dillon, A. Mr. Balfour, 1031

*Towns Improvements Bill*, Mr. Knox, Intro. 1712

*West Clare and Scheduled Districts*, Q. Mr. Jordan, A. Mr. Jackson, 1630

Irregularities in Post Office, 902

**ISAACS, Mr. Lewis H., Newington, Walworth**

Electric and Cable Railway Schemes, 1612

Shop Hours Bill, 1150

**ISAACSON, Mr. F. Wootton, Tower Hamlets, Stepney**

Supply—Embassies Vote, 1827

Watermen's and Lightermen's Company Bill, Intro. 299

Westminster Improvement Bill, 1767, 1771

**JACKSON, RIGHT HON. W. L. (Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), Leeds, N.**

Advances under Land Purchase Act, 313, 459

Arboriculture, 1523, 1636

Armagh Prison, 1376

Bann and Barrow Drainage, 452, 453, 815, 1619

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1344, 1352, 1355, 1362

Birth Certificates, Charges for, 1020, 1232, 1517

Capitation Grant, 1504

Clare Constabulary, 1783

Claremorris and Collooney Railway, 1633

Collector General of Rates, Dublin, 699

Congested Districts Boards, 464, 819, 895, 1009; Religious Opinions, 1028

Convict Joseph Mullett, 885, 1216

Donegall, Marquess of, 1398

Dundrum Lunatic Asylum, 1501

Ennis Burial Ground, 1215

[cont.]

**JACKSON, Right Hon. W. L.—cont.**

Enniskillen Gaol, 1396, 1524, 1632

Enniskillen Rents, 1525

Erasmus Smith Endowments, 1224

Evicted Tenants, 818, 1513

Fair Rent Appeals, 1519

Fair Rents, Co. Antrim, 1218

Fintona Police Barracks, 1784

Glenties Railway, 195

Glin Board of Guardians, 876

Green Street Court House, Dublin, 453, 880, 1619

High Sheriffs' Expenses, 1785

Hospital Grants, 448

Intermediate Education, 1507

Irish Education Grant, 454; Return, 195, 458; Bill, 1232

Irish Land Commission, 208

Irish Lunatic Asylum Salaries, 817

Jurors' Remuneration, 1206

Kerry County Cess, 1784

Kilkenny Coal Fields, 1011

Killybegs Harbour, 675

Kinsella, Matthew, 1624

Labourers' Acts, Local Inquiries, 1219

Labourers' Cottages in Athlone, 890

Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill, 1884

Land Commissioners, Enniskillen, 1397

Limerick Fishery Conservators, 1616

Limerick Lunatic Asylum, 816

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 1500

Lord Ashbrook's Evictions, 566

Listowel and Tarbert Railway, 1397

Mayors' Privileges, 1029

Montagu, Mrs., Arrest of 906, 1243

Mullingar Guardians, 1508

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 648

Nally, the late Convict, 1379, 1518

National Education (Ireland) Bill, 43, 968, 985, 987

National School Attendance, 1376

National School Teachers' Fees, 696

National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1544, 1546, 1551, 1559, 1798

Obstructions in River Bann, 1386

Payment to Jurors, 195

Philipstown Evictions, 1497

Planting Land in Galway, 180

Police Protection, Glashkinleen, 1018

Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill, 2R, 1711

Poor Law Unions, Ages, 1030

Public Health Acts, 1630

Public Meetings, 1520

Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 443, 1231, 1385, 1789

Queen's Plates in Ireland, 885

Queen's Speech, Mr. Sexton's Amendment, 482

Rating Law and Boards of Guardians, 1230

Reported Attempt to Wreck a Train, 1011

Resident Magistrates in Ireland, 688

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 803

[cont.]

**JACKSON, Right Hon. W. L.—cont.**

Stewart, Mr., of Horn Head, 674

Teachers' Pension Scheme, 1019, 1231

Trawling in Irish Bays, 1883, 1510, 1618, 1791

West Clare and Scheduled Districts, 1631

**JACOBY, Mr. J. A., Derbyshire, Mid**

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1429

**JAMES, Sir Henry, Bury, Lancashire**

Criminal Cases Appeals Bill, Intro. 572

Factory Inspectors, 690

Mersey and Irwell (Prevention of Pollution) Bill, 1363

**JEFFREYS, Mr. A. F., Hants, Basingstoke**

Admiralty New Buildings, 1225

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 183

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 932

Jeffries, G. L., Dismissal of, 679

**JENNINGS, Mr. L. J., Stockport**

Canada and United States Reciprocity, 680

Jersey, Bailiff of, 1375

Jobson, Mr., Case of, 680

**JOHNSTON, Mr. W., Belfast, S.**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1355, 1595, 1607

Capitation Grant, 1504

Congested Districts Board, 1028

Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 163

Irish Pawnbrokers, 200

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 775, 797

National Education (Ireland) Bill, 993

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1432

Queen's Speech, on Irish Amendment, 512

Royal Irish Rifles, Training, 455

Title of Lord Mayor, 875

**JOICEY, Mr. J., Durham, Chester-le-Street**

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1446

**JORDAN, Mr. J., Clare, W.**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1596

Claremorris and Collooney Railway, 1633

Deeds of Arrangement, 1525

Enniskillen Gaol, 1396, 1524, 1631

Enniskillen Rents, 1525

Land Commissioners, Enniskillen, 1397

Mails, Trippage Allowances, 1623

Public Health Act, 1630

West Clare Scheduled Districts, 1630

**Jurymen's Expenses (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 118]

Intro. Colonel Nolan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

**Justices of the Peace Bill** [c. No. 116]

Intro. Mr. Seale-Hayne; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

Debated, 2R. put off Six Months, 581

**Justices of the Peace (Qualification) Bill** [c. No. 93]

Intro. Sir J. Pease; Read 1<sup>o</sup> 167

**Justices of Peace in Ports**

Return of Names &c. (Mr. Chamberlain), 1332

**KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Right Hon. Sir U. J., Lancashire, Clitheroe**

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1529

National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1542, 1560, 1561

**KEAY, Mr. J. Seymour, Elgin and Nairn**

Bulwunt Rao of Indore, 1788

East India (Salaries) Return, 1794

Rules of Land Purchase Act, 1789

**KELLY, Mr. J. R., Camberwell, N.**

Justices of the Peace Bill, 587

London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1481, 1485

Shop Hours Bill, 1158, 1161

**KENNY, Dr. J. E., Cork Co., S.**

Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners) 355, 361

**KENNY, Mr. M. J., Tyrone, Mid**

Ballot Act—Illiterate Voters, 867

Green Street Court House, Dublin, 879

Local Authorities (Acquisition of Land) Bill, 1329

National Education (Ireland) Bill, 973, 998, 1317

Reported Attempt to Wreck a Train, 1011

**KENYON, Hon. G. T., Denbigh, &c.**

County Court Judges in Wales, 842

The Church in Wales, 1089

**KENYON-SLANEY, Colonel W., Shropshire, Newport**

Beer Adulteration Bill, Intro. 170

**KER, LORD (Marquess of Lothian) (Secretary for Scotland)**

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill, Presented, 1760



**KHEDIVE** (see Egypt)**KILBRIDE, Mr. D., Kerry, S.**

Green Street Court House, Dublin, 1619  
National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill,  
Intro. 163

**KIMBER, Mr. H., Wandsworth**

Electric and Cable Railway Schemes, 1611  
London County Council (Tramways) Bill,  
1476

**KIMBERLEY, Earl of**

County Council Candidates, 1006  
East India Officers' Bill, 439, 1198  
Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill, 414  
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 21  
Tariff Agreements, West Indies, &c. 870

**Kinsella, Matthew, 1624****Kitchen Boilers, Inspection, 1387****KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Hon. Edwd.,  
Rochester**

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 465

**KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Hon. H. T.,  
Kent, Faversham**

Caulkers in Royal Dockyards, 203  
County Court Judges in Wales, 846  
Education in Dockyard Towns, 199  
Greenwich Hospital, 1645

**KNOWLES, Mr. L., Salford, W.**

Local Authorities (Acquisition of Land) Bill,  
Intro. 298; 2R. 1929  
Plumbers' Registration Bill, Intro. 167; 2R.  
1883

**KNOX, Mr. E. F. V., Cavan, W.**

Annuities under Land and Congested  
Districts (Ireland) Act (1891), 186  
Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
1348, 1601  
Grand Juries, 1511  
Land Purchase Act (1885), 186; Rules, 1231  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 751, 1500  
Lough Erne Drainage Works, 187  
National Education (Ireland) Bill, 972, 992  
Rates, Division of, 1525  
Summary Jurisdiction Act (1879) Amend-  
ment Bill, 1185  
Towns Improvement (Ireland) Bill, Intro.  
1712  
Trees (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 165

**KNUTSFORD, LORD (Secretary of  
State for the Colonies)**

Colonies and M'Kinley Tariff, 1461  
Tariff Agreements, 871

**LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., Northampton**

Artillery Ranges, Maplin Sands, 448  
Black Rod, 1526  
British East Africa Company's Vote, 1237,  
1627  
Business of the House, 43, 1809  
Civil Service Bank, 1626  
Counting Votes at Elections, 1530  
Dronfield Justices and Mr. Harrison, 568  
Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill,  
1316  
Imprisonment for Debt, 1502  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 754  
Parliamentary Debates, 443  
Portland Prison Staff, 1626  
Queen's Speech, 369  
Supplementary Estimates, 1400  
Supply—Embassies, &c. 1322, 1825, 1823,  
1830  
Supply—London, &c. Police Courts, 1318  
Supply—Victoria Nyanza Railway, 1881

**Labour in Workhouses**

Cases before Magistrates, 456

**Labour Question, 380, 390****Labour, Royal Commission on**

Lady Sub-Commissioners, 461

**Labourers' Cottages Gardens Bill  
[c. No. 132]**

Intro. Sir E. Birkbeck; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 297

**Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill  
[c. No. 94]**

Intro. Dr. Tanner; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167  
Second Reading, 410  
Committee, 1460, 1884

**Labourers (Ireland) Bill [c. No. 39]**

Intro. Mr. J. Nolan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159  
Debate, 2R. 650, Adj., 662

**Lady Sub-Commissioners**

Q. Mr. Schwann, A. Mr. Goschen, 461

**LAFONE, Mr. A., Southwark, Bermondsey**

Technical Education, 452

**Lagos District Trade, 828, 1638****LAMINGTON, Lord**

Queen's Speech, Address, 13

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway**

Level Crossings on, 888  
Provisional Order Bill, 118

**Land Law (Ireland) Acts (1881 and 1887) Amendment Bill [c. No. 52]**Intro. Dr. Fitzgerald; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161**Land Stock**, 479, 484**LANE, Mr. W. J., Cork Co., E.**

Chicago World's Fair Commission, 1383

**LATHOM, EARLOF (Lord Chamberlain)**

Reported Her Majesty's Answer to Address, 665

**LAWRENCE, Mr. W. J., Liverpool, Abercromby**

Lagos District, 1638

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1433

School Board for London, 1660

Yellow Fever at Santos, 1631

**LAWSON, Mr. H. L. W., St. Pancras, W.**

Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill, Intro. 160

Licensing of Theatres, 695

Natal Government, 1795

Veterinary Department, 1237

**LEA, Mr. Thomas, Londonderry, S.**

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1679

Jurors' Remuneration, 1206

Morning Sittings, 1818

St. Catherine's Lighthouse, 321

Stranraer Mails, 188

**Leadership of the House**, 58, 72**LEAHY, Mr. J., Kildare, S.**

Drainage of the Barrow and Bann, 452

**LEAKE, Mr. R., Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe**

Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Intro. 158

**LEAMY, Mr. E., Sligo S.**

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 656

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 765

Queen's Speech, 272

**Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill [c. No. 173]**Intro. Mr. Lawson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160, 806**LECHMERE, Sir E. A., Worcestershire, Bewdley**

Boilers' Inspection and Registration Bill, Intro. 162

**Lecky, Mr. (Quotations from)**, 67, 230, 395**LEFEVRE, Right Hon. J. G. Shaw, Bradford, Central**

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1679, 1707

Footpaths' Bill, Intro. 554

Plural Voting (Abolition) Bill, Intro. 160

Military Lands Consolidation Bill, 1883

Ranges Act (1891) Amendment Bill, Intro. 572

Westminster Improvement Bill, 1769

**LEIGHTON, Mr. Stanley, Shropshire, Oswestry**

Frozen Meat, 1799

Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1406

Rating Exemption, Elementary Schools, 1387

**LENG, Mr. J., Dundee**

Crimean and Indian Mutiny Pensions, 1012

Foreign Tariffs, 180

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 298

"Germanic" Mails, 313

National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1550

Parliamentary Reports, 1227

Patent Office, Reduction of Fees, 559

Reuter's Parliamentary Debates, 884

**LEON, Mr. H. S., Bucks, N.**

Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Intro. 162

Unpensioned Veterans, 811

**Letter Cards, Income from**, 1496**Letters from Abroad**

Charges for Re-addressing, 692

**Liberal Unionists**, 38, 76, 235, 370, 378, 397**Licensing of Theatres**

Q. Mr. Lawson, A. Mr. Matthews, 695

**Licences in Mortmain**, 1506**Life-Saving at Sea, Acts of Bravery**

New Decoration for, 558

**Lights in Red Sea**

Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 816

**Limited Partnerships Bill [c. No. 175]**Intro. Mr. Rathbone; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 806**Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill [c. No. 48]**Intro. Mr. M'Lagan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160

MAC NEILL, Mr. J. G. Swift—*cont.*

Queen's Speech, 286; Amendment, Indian Civil Service, 395, 404

Stewart, Mr., of Horn Head, J.P. 674

Supply—Civil Service, South Africa, 1831, 1833, 1834

Supply—Relief of Irish Distress, 1573

Under Secretary for India, 1800

MCCALMONT, Captain J., *Antrim, E.*

Grants to Irish Hospitals, 448

Irish Mails, Stranraer and Larne, 882

MCCARTAN, Mr. M., *Down, S.*

Balacava Veterans, 1505

District Registries, 694

Kinsella, Matthew, 1624

Leaseholders and Land Act of 1887, 1215

Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 572

Mullett, Joseph, Convict, 885, 1216

Nally, Death of, 1518, 1778

Newcastle Harbour, County Down, 886, 1216, 1780

Obstructions in River Bann, 1386

Telegraph Clerks Pay, &c. 887, 1226 1636

MCCARTHY, Mr. Justin, *Londonderry City*

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 729

National Education (Ireland) Bill, 982

Morning Sittings, 1817

Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners). 340

MCDONALD, Dr. R., *Ross and Cromarty*

Carlway Pier, 1526

Procurator Fiscal and Gaelic Language, 567

MCKENNA, Sir Joseph N., *Monaghan, S.*

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1340, 1594

Financial Relations Committee (England, Scotland, and Ireland), 1017

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 647

National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1546

Queen's Speech, 284

M'Kevitt, James, 458

M'Kinley Tariff and West Indies, 894

McLAGAN, Mr. P., *Linlithgow*

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 160

McLAREN, Mr. W. S. B., *Cheshire, Crewe*

Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) (No. 2) Bill, 159

Shop Hours Bill, 1173

MADDEN, Right Hon. D. H. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*

Bantry Quarter Sessions, 1394

Belfast Street Betting, 567

Clogher Quarter Sessions, 815

Cork Bankruptcy Court, 681

County Courts in Ireland, 202

Deeds of Arrangement in Ireland, 20 1525

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1707

District Registry for Belfast, 889

Grand Juries, 1511

Irish Civil Bill Officers, 682

Irish Drainage Acts Amendment, 1029

Irish Pawnbrokers, 200

Irish Receiverships, 904

Local Courts of Bankruptcy Bill, 1576

Leaseholders and Land Act, 1215

Lord Kenmare and his Tenantry, 1242

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 642

Nally, Death of, 1518, 1779

O'Connor, Captain, and Receivership, 1027

Public Meetings, 1521

Salmon Fishery, Lord Ventry's, 1240

MADEN, Mr. J. H., *Lancashire, Rossendale*

Queen's Speech, 388

Magazine Rifle, New, 1634

Magistrates in Police Burghs (Scotland) Bill [c No. 108]

Intro. Mr. H. Elliot; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169

MAHONY, Mr. P., *Meath, N.*

Irish Cattle Truck Rates, 871

Irish Poor Law Unions, 1090

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 651

Limerick Fishery Conservators, 1616

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 751

National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1546 1563

Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill, Intro 1330

Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners) 344

MAILS (see *POST OFFICE*)

Eastern Indian and Australian, 201

"Germanic," 313

Portsmouth and Ryde Contract, 41

MAKINS, Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.W.*

Westminster (Parliament Street) Improvement Bill, 1764

MALCOLM, Colonel J. W., *Argyllshire*

Volunteer Commanding Officers, 561

**MALLOCK, Mr. R., Devon, Torquay**

Fish Landed at Brixham, 670

**Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway**

(Extension to London, &amp;c.) Bill, 2R. Debated, 1771, Adjourned, 1772

Provisional Order Bill, 118

**MANFIELD, Mr. M. P., Northampton**

County Council Candidates, 1080

Justices of the Peace Bill, 601

**Maplin Sands, Artillery Ranges, Costs**

Q. Mr. Labouchere, A. Sir John Gorst, 448

**Marine Police Service**

Illegal Trawling in Scottish Waters, 874

**Marines Harvesting, 1786****Maritime Conference, Washington**

Recommendations of, 900

**MARJORIBANKS, Right Hon. E., Berwickshire**

Education and Local Taxation, &amp;c. Bill, 1282

**Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill [c. No. 57]**Intro. Mr. Leon; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162**Marriages Abroad Bill [l. No. 30]**Presented, Lord Chancellor; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1760**Married Women Bill [c. No. 81]**Intro. Mr. Ambrose; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165**MASKELYNE, Mr. M. H. N. STORY-, Wilts, Cricklade**

Justices of the Peace Bill, 606

**MATHER, Mr. W., Lancashire, S.E., Gorton**

Hospitals, &amp;c. (Assistance from Rates) Bill, Intro. 168

Labourers, Woolwich Arsenal, 1621

**MATTHEWS, RIGHT HON. H. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), Birmingham, E.**

"Anarchist" Prosecution, 697

Bailiff of Jersey and the Daniel Case, 1975

Betting and Gambling Laws, 196

Brushmakers' Strike, Sheffield, 462

Convict Clarke, 1524, 1790

Counting Votes at Elections, 1530

Cruelty to Children, 450; at Helston, 899

[cont.]

**MATTHEWS, Right Hon. H.—cont.**

Dronfield Justices and Mr. Harrison, 568

Factory Inspectors, 691

Florence Cawood, Case of, 1632

Gallagher's, Dr., Insanity, 672, 1396

Illiterate Voters, 691

Imprisonment for Debt, 1502

Justices of the Peace Bill, 594

Kitchen Boilers' Inspection, 1387

Licences in Mortmain, 1506

Licensing of Theatres, 695

Meetings at World's End, 1529

Mines and Factories, Isle of Man, 1026

M'Kevitt's, James, Sentence, 458

Nunn, Thomas, Case of, 442

Open Air Meeting Places, 1232

Police Pensions, &amp;c. 1786

Political Prisoners, Portland, 1396

Portland Prison Staff, 1627

Prison Commissioners, 198

Prison Warders, Pay, &amp;c. 1213

Queen's Speech, Address, 153, 250

Salvation Army, Eastbourne, 1023, 1219

Shop Hours Bill, 1167

South Wales Colliery Statistics, 1388

Street Paving at West End, 1789

Title of Lord Mayor, Ireland, 875

Treason-Felony Prisoners, 879, 1226, 1511

Wall's, James, Sentence, 673

Wormwood Scrubbs Prison, 197

**MATTINSON, Mr. M. W., Liverpool, Walton**

Municipal Corporations Act (1882) Amendment Bill, Intro. 158

**MAXWELL, Sir Herbert E., Wigton**

Parliamentary Papers Distribution, 1125

**Medina Tunnel Bill**

l. 2nd Reading, 872

**Merchant Seamen (Provisions) Bill [c. No. 109]**Intro. Mr. J. Wilson (Durham); Read 1<sup>o</sup> 169**Mersey and Irwell (Prevention of Pollution) Bill**Debate, 1363; Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1365**Messengers and Doorkeepers in Civil Service**

Compulsory Retirement of, 456

**Metropolitan Cattle Market**

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 181

**Midland and South Western Junction Railway**

Death of James Chard, 179

Provisional Order Bill, 119

**MIDDLETON, Viscount**

London Fog, 301; for Royal Commission, 1200

**MILDMAY, Mr. F. B., *Devon, Totnes***

Naval Gun Practice off Plymouth, 689

**Military Lands Consolidation Bill**  
[c. No. 184]

Intro. Mr. E. Stanhope; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1000  
2nd R. deferred, 1883

**Millbank Prison Bill** [c. No. 140]

Intro. Sir John Gorst; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 298  
2 R. deferred, 553  
Second Reading, 798  
In Com. 1328, R. P. 1459, Reported, 1575

**MILVAIN, Mr. T., *Durham***

Corporal Punishment Bill, Intro. 171  
Queen's Speech, Seconding Address in  
Answer to, 51

**Mines (Eight Hours) Bill** [c. No. 29]

Intro. Mr. Leake; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158

**Mining Accidents' Insurance (Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 160]

Intro. Mr. Baird; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 554

Mint, Coinage Designs Committee's  
Report, 196

"Moderate Liberals," 371

"Moderate Protection," 115

Mombasa (see *British East Africa*)

Montagu's, Mrs., Arrest, 906, 1242

**MORGAN, Right Hon. G. Osborne,**  
*Denbighshire, E.*

Burials Bill, Intro., 164  
County Court Judges in Wales, 835  
H.M.S. *Espiegle*, Chilian Specie Shipment, 444  
Supply—Civil Services, South Africa, 1833  
Supply—Embassies Vote, 1828  
The Church in Wales, 1073, 1104

**MORGAN, Mr. Octavius V., *Battersea***

Balaclava Veterans, 1504  
Registration Acts (Lodgers) Amendment  
Bill, Intro. 165  
Signalling Instruction, 1800

**MORGAN, Mr. W. Pritchard, *Mertl Tydvil***

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1887) Amendment Bill, Intro. 160  
Gold Mine Royalties, 679, 823

**MORLEY, EARL OF (Chairman of Committees)**

Medina Tunnel Bill, 2R. 872

**MORLEY, Mr. Arnold, *Nottingham, I***  
New Writ for Kirkcaldy Burghs, 1365**MORLEY, Right Hon. John, *Newcas upon-Tyne***

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1707  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 721. 91  
National Education (Ireland) Bill, 977  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1417  
Queen's Speech, Address, 225

**MORROGH, Mr. J., *Cork Co, S.E.***

Haulbowline Docks, 815, 1225  
Kinsale Harbour Debt, 1507  
Naval Repairs on Irish Stations, 1015

**MORTON, Mr. A. C., *Peterborough***

Betting and Gambling Laws, 196  
Diplomatic Vote, 1532  
East Africa Company's Vote, 1237  
Property Assessments, 322  
Queen's Speech, 380, 387  
Return Tickets Bill, Intro. 166  
Ships' Lights, 1501  
Supply—Embassies, 1320, 1326  
London Police Courts, 1319

**MOUNT EDGCUMBE, EARL OF**  
(Lord Steward)

A Lord Commissioner, 1  
Presented Archdeaconry of Cornwall 38; 2R. 873

**MULHOLLAND, Mr. H. L., *Londonde N.***

Jurors' Remuneration, 1206  
Stranraer Mails, 1207

**Mullett, Joseph, *Convict***

Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Mr. Jackson, 885

**MUNDELLA, Right Hon. A. J., *Sheff Brightside***

Death of James Chard, 179; or Cho 898  
Gresham Charter, 1531  
London County Council (*Tramways*) 1487, 1489  
Woolwich Arsenal, Steel Forges, 825

**Municipal Corporation Act (1882)  
Amendment Bill** [c. No. 35]Intro. Mr. Mattinson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158**Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 34]Intro. Mr. Condon; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158Debated, 613; Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 649

Com. R.P. 806, R.P. 1186, R.P. 1460

**Municipal Franchise (Ireland) (No. 2)  
Bill** [c. No. 47]Intro. Mr. J. O'Connor; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160

Withdrawn, 1184

**MURPHY, Mr. W. M., Dublin, St.  
Patrick's**

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 630

**Music Halls and Theatres Licensing**

Select Committee on, 695

**Nally, P. W. (see IRELAND—Law  
and Police)****National Debt (Military Savings  
Banks), Account pres., 1187****National Education (Ireland) Bill**

Notice to bring in, 43

Motion for Leave, 968; Adj., 999

Further Adj., 1316

**National Institutions (Wales) Bill**  
[c. No. 115]Intro. Mr. A. Thomas; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 170**National School Teachers' (Ireland)  
Bill** [c. No. 64]Intro. Mr. Kilbride; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 163**National School Teachers' (Ireland)  
(No. 2) Bill** [c. No. 87]Intro. Mr. H. Campbell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166**Nationalist Party, 220 (see Home Rule,  
&c.)****NAVY (see also ADMIRALTY)***Appropriation Account*, 1890-91, pres. 663*Boilers, Failure of*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Mr. Forwood, 683*Caulkers in Royal Dockyards*, Q. Mr. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, A. Mr. Forwood, 203*Coastguardman O'Halloran*, Q. Admiral Field, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1210*Estimates*, 1892-3, pres. 1187

[cont.]

**NAVY—cont.***Estimates on Table*, Q. Mr. H. H. Fowler, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1639*Fog Accidents in Dockyards*, Q. Mr. Norris, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 883*Greenwich Age Pensions*, Correspondence ordered, 555; Q. Sir W. Crossman, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1875*Greenwich Hospital Repairs*, Q. Sir. W. Crossman, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1372*Gun Practice off Plymouth*, Q. Mr. Mildmay, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 689*Haulbowline Docks*, Qs. Mr. Morrogh, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, 815, Lord G. Hamilton, 1225, 1779; *Depth of Channel*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 900; *Dockyard Staff*, Q. Mr. Hammond, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1792*H.M.S. "Espiegle" and Chilean Specie*, Q. Mr. G. O. Morgan, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 444*H.M.S. "Victoria," Stranding of*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 187*Marines Employed in Harvesting*, Q. Mr. Logan, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1786*Naval Repairs on Irish Stations*, Q. Mr. Morrogh, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1015*Naval Reserve and Indian Marine*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Mr. Forwood, 693*New Admiralty Buildings*, Q. Mr. Jeffreys, A. Mr. Plunket, 1025*Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers*, Qs. Mr. Noble, Mr. Llewellyn, As. Lord G. Hamilton, 191, 1617 (see also under ARMY)*Slave Trade Suppression*, Q. Mr. P. Smith, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1225*Torpedo Vessels, Importance of*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Lord G. Hamilton, 1614**Naturalisation, South America, 1228****NEVILLE, Mr. R., Liverpool, Exchange***Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill*, 1608

Customs Officers, 1515

*Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners)*, 360**NEWFOUNDLAND, 23, 32, 149, 382****New Zealand (see COLONIES)****NOBLE, Mr. W., Hastings***Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers*, 191**NOLAN, Colonel J. P., Galway, N.***Congested Districts Boards*, 463*Convict Mullett's Health*, 1217*Fishery Laws (Ireland) Amendment Bill*, Intro. 1576*Irish Education Bill*, 1232*Irish Education Grant*, 454*Irish Trawling*, 1382

[cont.]

NOLAN, Colonel J. P.—*cont.*

- Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 790
- Jurymen's Expenses (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 171
- National Education (Ireland) Bill, 981, 984, 985
- National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1538, 1543, 1549, 1555, 1563, 1798
- Pensions to Irish Teachers, 1231
- Planting of Land in Galway, 180
- Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1429
- Queen's Speech, on Irish Amendment, 519
- Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts, &c. Bill 804
- Scotch Trawling, 1382
- Trawling in Ireland, 1509, 1617, 1790
- Webster's, Sergt.-Major, Pension, 1012

NOLAN, Mr. Joseph, *Louth, N.*

- Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 159; 2nd R. 649
- Queen's Speech (Treason Felony), 366

NORRIS, Mr. E. S., *Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*

- Cruelty at Helston, Case of, 899
- Fog Accidents, Admiralty Docks, 883
- Southampton Docks Bill, 2R. 1581, 1587

## North Eastern Railway

- Provisional Order Bill, 118

*North Park, Eltham*

- Q. Sir J. Lubbock, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1230

## North Staffordshire Railway

- Provisional Order Bill, 118

## NORTHBROOK, Earl of

- East India Officers' Bill, 433; Amendments, 1189, 1193
- Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill, 416

## NORTON, Lord

- Betting and Loans (Infants) Bill, 1004
- Technical Instruction, 423

## Noxious Gases Commission, 303, 307

## Nunn, Thomas, Case of, 442

O'BRIEN, Mr. Patrick, *Monaghan, N.*

- Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1606
- Constable Gurry, 1503
- Convict Clarke, 1524, 1790
- Convict James M'Kevitt, 458
- Evicted Tenants, 1513
- Montagu, Mrs., Case of, 906, 1242
- Nally, the late Convict, 1380, 1778, 1779
- National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1548

[*cont.*]O'BRIEN, Mr. Patrick—*cont.*

- Philipstown Evictions, 1497
- Political Prisoners, Portland, 1396
- Post Office, Dublin, 1512
- Public Meetings, 1521
- Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners 362
- Tipperary Post, 1519
- Treason Felony Prisoners, 879, 1226, 1511
- Upprchurch, Sunday Post, 1635

O'BRIEN, Mr. William, *Cork County, N.E.*

- Evicted Tenants and Land Purchase Act 818
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1683, 1686
- Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners 267

## Occupying Tenants Enfranchisement Bill [c. No. 151]

- Intro. Mr. Bartley; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

O'CONNOR, Mr. Arthur, *Donegal, E.*

- Army Retirement, 1514
- Compulsory Sale of Land (Ireland) Bill Intro. 161, 2R. 1184
- Congested Districts Board, Expenditure 1010
- Crimean, &c. Pensions, 1013
- East Africa Company's Expenditure, 1236
- Morning Sittings, 1819
- National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1559
- Queen's Printers' Alterations, 687
- Royal University of Ireland, Income Tax 1217
- Stewart, Mr. C. P., 675

O'CONNOR, Mr. John, *Tipperary, S.*

- Municipal Franchise (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill Intro. 160
- National Education (Ireland) Bill, 988
- National Teachers' Fund—Supply, 1551
- Queen's Speech, 259

## O'Conor, Captain, and Receivership

- Director of *Freeman's Journal*, 904

## Official Auditors

- Q. Colonel H. Vincent, A. Mr. Ritchie, 15

O'HANLON, Mr. T., *Cavan, E.*

- Glenties Railway, 195
- Payment to Jurors in Ireland, 195
- Queen's Speech, 295
- Town Holdings (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 164

O'KEEFE, Mr. F. A., *Limerick*

- Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 162
- Limerick Lunatic Asylum, 315

[*cont.*]

E, Mr. F. A.—*cont.*

Privileges, 1029

s Plates in Ireland, 885

s Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners)

X, Mr. J. J., *Roscommon, N.*

tural Returns for England, 1229,

Corporation (Lunatic Asylum) Bill,

ted Districts Board, Co. Roscommon,

i Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 158;  
R. 1665

al Education (Ireland) Bill, 973, 980

: *Pensions*

onel Howard Vincent, A. Mr. A. J.  
our, 202

**ge Provident Pensions Bill**  
No. 60]

Mr. Bartley; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162

D, Mr. M., *Dewsbury*

Investment Act (1889) Amendment  
Intro. 1885

L, Hon. R. T., *Antrim, Mid*

rs' Apprentices (Ireland) Bill, Intro.

*ir Meetings in London*

J. Rowlands, A. Mr. Matthews, 1232

Trade and Poppy Cultivation,  
139

*Trade in India*

S. Smith, A. Mr. Curzon, 185

a, Mr. Mark Stewart, 810

s Speech, Debate on, 84, 139

L. Fry, A. Mr. Curzon, 1209

re Factories Overtime, 824

re Store Department

ers, Numbers and Wages, 671

sal of Mr. Shallard, 823

re *Survey*

Committee ordered, 300

nces of Employees, Q. Mr. F. Mackin-  
A. Mr. Chaplin, 878

274

**Outdoor Relief (Ireland) Bill** [c. No.  
70]

Intro. Mr. Cox; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164

**Outdoor Provident Relief Bill** [c.  
No. 124]

Intro. Mr. Bartley; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 172

**Outlawries Bill**

c. Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 38

*Outrage near Canton*

Q. Admiral Field, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther,  
1212

Overcrowding on Railways, 898, 1390

Overloading Prosecutions, 1239

Paddy Tax in Ceylon, 201

Parcel Post (U.S.A. and Great Britain)

Return ordered (Mr. H. Heaton), 300

Return presented, 807

Parcels Post and Dairy Produce,  
811

Paris, British Vice Consul in

Charge against, 813

**Parish Councils, &c. Bill** [c. No. 98]

Intro. Mr. Cobb; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167

PARKER, Mr. C. S., *Perth*

Education and Local Taxation &c. Bill  
1287

## Parliament

LORDS—

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT, 9th Feb.

The SESSION OF PARLIAMENT opened by Com-  
mission

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Delivered

**Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech**

delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR,

The Queen's Speech having been reported  
by the LORD CHANCELLOR, an Address to  
HER MAJESTY thereon moved by the Earl  
of DUDLEY, 9th Feb. 6 (the Motion being  
seconded by the Lord LAMINGTON, 13  
Address agreed to, *nemine dissente*, 38

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS

Reported 18th Feb., 665

*Chairman of Committees.* The Earl of  
Morley appointed, *nemine dissente*, to

[*cont.*



*PARLIAMENT—Lords—cont.*

take the Chair in all Coms. of this House for this Session 9 Feb., 38

*Journals, Sub-Committee for*, Appointed, 9 Feb., 38

*Privileges, Committee for*, Appointed, 9 Feb., 38

*Appeal Committee*, Appointed, 9 Feb. 38

*Business of the House*

Order as to Tuesday Sittings, 26 Feb., 1833

*Miscellaneous*

*Stoppages in the Streets*, Orders to prevent, renewed, 9 Feb., 38

*New Peers*

25 Feb.—Sir William Thomson, Knight, created Baron Kelvin of Largs in the County of Ayr, 1189

3 March.—Sir Arthur William Acland Hood, created Baron Hood of Avalon in the County of Somerset, 1759

*Representative Peer for Ireland*

Lord Dunally, 5

*Representative Peer for Scotland*

The Earl of Leven and Melville, 5

*Sat First*

9 Feb.—The Earl of Dartmouth, after the death of his father, 5  
The Duke of Devonshire, after the death of his father, 5  
The Lord Cheylesmore, after the death of his father, 5

18 Feb.—The Earl of Portsmouth, after the death of his father, 665

*Standing Committees*

Committee of Selection appointed 16 Feb., 557

Chairman and Members nominated 19 Feb., 809

*Took the Oath for the First Time*

9 Feb.—The Lord Archbishop of York, 5  
The Lord Bishop of Chester, 5  
The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, 5

18 Feb.—The Lord Bishop of Bangor, 665

## COMMONS—

*Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech*

The Queen's Speech having been reported by the SPEAKER: 9 Feb. An humble Address thereon moved by Mr. Hermon-Hodge, 43, and Motion seconded by Mr. Milvain, 51. Amendment (Mr. James Lowther), 96; Withdrawn, 116. Amendment Mr. J. E. Redmond, 11 Feb. 236; Division, 12 Feb.

[cont.]

*PARLIAMENT—Commons—cont.*

369. Amendment, Mr. J. G. S. MacNeill, 12 Feb. 396; Withdrawn, 409. Amendment, Mr. Sexton, 15 Feb. 468, Division, 552, Address agreed to, 15 Feb., 552

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS, Reported, Lord A. Hill, 29 Feb., 1490

*Business of the House and Public Business*

Qs. Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Sexton, As. Mr. A. J. Balfour (First Lord of Treasury) 9 Feb. 43;—Qs. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Mr. J. Dillon, As. Mr. Balfour, 22 Feb., 907;—Qs. Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. MacNeill, As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 23 Feb., 1031, 1032;—Qs. Obs.—Mr. Sexton, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 25 Feb., 1244;—Qs. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. J. E. Ellis, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Bryce, As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 26 Feb., 1398, 1400; Qs. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Morton, A. Mr. Balfour, 1590, 1593;—*Morning Sittings*, Q. Motion, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Cremer, Mr. J. Rowlands, Mr. Sexton, 1801

*Committees*

*Privileges*, Com. ordered, 9 Feb., 41

*Public Petitions*, nominated, 23 Feb., 1126

*Selection*, Com. of, nominated, 11 Feb. 179

*Standing Orders*, Select Com. nominated, 11 Feb. 179

*Members*

*Chiltern Hundreds*, Precedents for granting, 462

*De Cobain, Mr.*, Motion made, "That Mr. Edward Samuel Wesley De Cobain do attend this House in his place upon Tuesday, the 23rd of February, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 11 Feb., 204; Amendment Mr. T. M. Healy, 204; Obs. Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. T. Sexton, Mr. C. Darling; Order made, 209; Order read, and Mr. De Cobain not appearing when called, Notice given for Motion of Expulsion, Mr. Balfour, 23rd Feb., 1032; Resolution agreed to, 26th Feb., 1401

*Personal Explanation*, Mr. Mac Neill and Mr. Curzon, 466

*Miscellaneous*

*Division Lists*, Corrections, Mr. W. A. Macdonald, 465; Mr. T. Robinson, 613

*Illiterate Voters at Parliamentary Elections*. Q. Mr. Webster, A. Mr. Matthews, 691; Motion for Abolition, Mr. Webster, 863

*New Members Sworn, 42*

9 Feb.—Right Hon. W. L. Jackson, Leeds  
Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, Bart., Manchester, N.E.

[cont.]

**LIAMENT—Commons—New Members,**  
*lc.—cont.*

Graham Murray, Esquire, Bute  
 Right Hon. Lord Walter Gordon  
 Lennox, Sussex, Chichester Division  
 John Penn, Esquire, Lewisham  
 Hon. Humphrey N. Sturt, Dorset,  
 E.  
 John E. Redmond, Esquire, Water-  
 ford City  
 Edward T. Holden, Esquire, Walsall  
 Richard C. Jebb, Esquire, Cam-  
 bridge University  
 Martin Flavin, Esquire, Cork  
 Patrick Macdermott, Esquire, Kil-  
 kenny, N.  
 Hon. W. Fred. D. Smith, Strand,  
 Westminster  
 Dunbar P. Barton, Esquire, Ar-  
 magh, Mid  
 George Lambert, Esquire, Devon,  
 South Molton  
 John Henry Maden, Esquire, Lan-  
 cashire, Rossendale

*Feb.*—John Archibald Willcox, Esquire,  
 Liverpool, Everton

**Writs**

*ring Recess, 39*

*For* Lewisham, *v.* Right Hon. Vis-  
 count Lewisham, called to the  
 House of Peers as Earl of Dart-  
 mouth  
*For* Cambridge University, *v.* Right  
 Hon. H. C. Raikes, deceased  
*For* Manchester, N.E., *v.* Right  
 Hon. Sir James Fergusson, Bart.,  
 Postmaster General  
*For* Bute, *v.* Right Hon. J. P. B.  
 Robertson, Lord Justice General  
 of Scotland  
*For* Strand, *v.* Right Hon. W. H.  
 Smith, deceased  
*For* County of Kilkenny, N. Divi-  
 sion, *v.* Sir John Pope Hennessy,  
 deceased  
*For* Devon, South Molton Division,  
*v.* Viscount Lynton, called to  
 the House of Peers as Earl of  
 Portsmouth  
*For* Cork City, *v.* Mr. C. S. Parnell,  
 deceased  
*For* Leeds, N., *v.* Right Hon. W. L.  
 Jackson, Chief Secretary for Ire-  
 land  
*For* Dorset, E., *v.* Mr. G. H. Bond,  
 deceased  
*For* Sussex, S.W., *v.* Lord Walter  
 Gordon Lennox, Treasurer of Her  
 Majesty's Household  
*For* Armagh, Mid, *v.* Sir James  
 P. Corry, Bart., deceased  
*For* Waterford City, *v.* Mr. Richard  
 Power, deceased  
*For* County of Lancaster, Rossen-  
 dale, *v.* Right Hon. the Marquess  
*cont.*

**PARLIAMENT—Commons—New Writs—**  
*During Recess—cont.*

of Hartington, called to the  
 House of Peers as Duke of Devon-  
 shire  
*10 Feb.*—*For* Liverpool, Everton Division, *v.*  
 Edward Whitley, deceased, 117  
*22 Feb.*—*For* Derbyshire, Southern Division,  
*v.* Henry Wardle, 911  
*22 Feb.*—*For* Surrey, Chertsey Division, *v.*  
 F. A. Hankey, 911  
*26 Feb.*—*For* Kirkcaldy District of Burghs,  
*v.* Sir G. Campbell, 1365  
*1 Mar.*—*For* County of Wexford, Northern  
 Division, *v.* John E. Redmond,  
 Manor of Northstead, 1613  
*For* Borough of Belfast, East Divi-  
 sion, *v.* E. S. W. De Cobain,  
 expelled, 1613

**Orders and Resolutions**

*Elections*, Selection of Constituency, 39  
 Peers voting, 40  
 Peers as Candidates, 40  
 Corrupt Practices, 40

*Journals*, Printing, 41

*Police*, Stoppage of Streets, 40

*Votes and Proceedings*, Printing, 41

*Witnesses*, Tampering with; False Evi-  
 dence, 40

**Parliamentary Papers**

*Debates and Proceedings* (see title *Reuter's*)  
*Journals*, Order for Printing, 41

**Rules and Order of Debate** (see  
**SPEAKER, The**)**Sittings and Adjournments of the House**

*Ash Wednesday*, Motion and Division, 1  
*Mar.*, 1642

*Count Out*, 19 *Feb.*, 868; Q. Dr. Cameron, A.  
 Mr. A. J. Balfour, Obs. Sir W. Harcourt,  
 Mr. Bryce, 22 *Feb.*, 908

*Morning Sittings, Tuesdays and Fridays*,  
 Obs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Sexton, Mr. J.  
 Redmond, 1 *Mar.*, 1639; *Motion*, De-  
 bated, 3 *Mar.*, 1801; Division, Reso.  
 agreed to, 1822

*Nine O'clock Sittings*, Sessional Order made  
 a Standing Order, 3 *Mar.* 1823

**PALACE OF WESTMINSTER****House of Commons**

*Lighting the Library*, Q. Mr. Bartley, A. Mr.  
 Plunket, 506

**Parliamentary Debates** (see title  
**Reuter's**)**Parliamentary Elections Bill** [c. No.  
78]

Intro. Mr. Sheehy; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

**Parliamentary Elections (No. 2) Bill**  
[c. No. 91]Intro. Mr. Howell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166**Parliamentary Elections (Votes of Seamen) Bill** [c. No. 187]Intro. Mr. Heneage; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1127**Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill** [c. No. 36]Intro. Sir A. Rollit; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159**Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) (No. 2) Bill** [c. No. 37]Intro. Mr. M<sup>c</sup>Laren; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159**Parliamentary Papers Distribution**

Motion for Select Committee (Sir H. Maxwell), 1125; Com. nominated, 1126

PARNELL, the late Mr. C. S., 135, 217, 287, 356, 499, 507

“Parnellite Juice,” 102, 225

**Parochial Boards (Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 120]Intro. Dr. Cameron; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171PAULTON, Mr. J. M., *Durham, Bishop Auckland*

School Books in Voluntary Schools, 316

**Pauperism (England and Scotland)**

Return of Numbers, &amp;c. (Mr. Long), 1128

**Pauper Relief**, 1891

Qs. Mr. Summers, Mr. A. Acland, Sir W. Foster, A. Mr. Ritchie, 820

**Pawnbrokers**, Irish, 200**Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act**

Copy of Order in Council, 556

**PEARSON, RIGHT HON. SIR C. J.**  
(Lord Advocate), *Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill, 318

Crofter Commission, 1496

Crofter Emigration, 459

Deer Forests Return, 317

Education and Local Taxation Relief (Scotland) Bill, 1245, 1283, 1312, 1883

Garve and Ullapool Railway, 1620

Illegal Trawling, Scottish Waters, 874

Police and Public Health Bill, 1774

[cont.]

**PEARSON, Right Hon. Sir C. J.—cont.**Procurator Fiscal, Ross and Cromarty, 56  
Public Houses (Hours of Closing) (Scotland Bill, 2R. 410

School Attendance, Highlands and Islands, 879

Scotch Trawling, 1882

Scottish Education Code, 1239

Scottish Poorhouses, 1493

Sheriff Substitute at Airdrie, 1230

Theological Tests, Scottish Universities, 1  
Western Highlands Requirements, 1620**PEASE, Mr. A. E., York**

Trinidad Judgeship, 1491

**PEASE, Sir Joseph W., Durham, Barna Castle**

Justices of the Peace (Qualification) Bill, Intro. 167

Opium Cultivation in Bengal, 1206

Prison Warders' Claims, 1218

Queen's Speech, Address, 138

**Pensions and Superannuation Allowances**

Q. Mr. F. Stevenson, A. Mr. Goschen, 151

**Pensions, Old Age**

Select Committee asked for, 202

State Pensions, Q. Colonel H. Vincent, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 901

Greenwich Age Pensions (see NAVY)

**Pensions (Old Age) Bill** [c. No. 46]Intro. Sir W. Foster; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160**“Periodical Returns,” Irish Land Act**  
700**Persia, Tobacco Corporation of**

Abolition of Concession, 891

**PHILIPPS, Mr. J. W., Lanark, Mid**

Lord Lieutenant and County Magistrate Bill, Intro. 299

Rural Postmen's Pay, &amp;c. 1218

Sheriff Clerks Depute (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 1330

**PICKERSGILL, Mr. E. H., Bethel Green, S.W.**

Nunn, Thomas, Case of, 442

Poor Rate (Metropolis) Bill, Intro. 163

Prison Commissioners, 197

Stationery Office Contract Circulars, 564

Waterlow &amp; Sons' Contract, 197

Wormwood Scrub Prison, 196

**PICTON, Mr. J. A., Leicester**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1598

Business of the House, 1820

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, London Cattle Market, 181, 184

Gresham University, 695

Legislative Council of Cyprus, 1369

**Piers and Harbours (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 72]

Intro. Mr. Dillon; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164

**Pig Iron Warrants Bill** [c. No. 66]

Intro. Mr. Hingley; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 163

**PINKERTON, Mr. J., Galway**

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 1603

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1673

Fair Rent Applications, Antrim, 1218

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 772

River Bann Obstructions, 1618

**Places of Worship Enfranchisement Bill** [c. No. 28]

Intro. Mr. Bryn Roberts; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 157

**Places of Worship (Sites) Bill** [c. No. 135]

Intro. Mr. J. Ellis; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 298

2R deferred, 806

**PLOWDEN, Sir William C., Wolverhampton, West**

Guardians of the Poor Qualification Bill, 323

Indian Councils Act (1861) Amendment (No. 2) Bill, Intro. 1187

**Plumbers' Registration Bill** [c. No. 95]

Intro. Mr. Knowles; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167

Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1883, and com. to Select Com.

**PLUNKET, RIGHT HON. D. R. (First Commissioner of Works), Dublin University**

Admiralty New Buildings, 1025

British Picture Gallery, 446, 1493

Library Lights, 566

Queen's Speech, Address, 127

South Kensington Museum, 566

Westminster Abbey, Chapels closed, 677

Westminster (Parliament Street, &c.) Improvement Bill, 1767, 1769

**Plural Voting (Abolition) Bill** [c. No. 42]

Intro. Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 160

Police (see *HOME OFFICE*, or *IRELAND*)

**Police Disabilities Removal (Extension) Bill** [c. No. 99]

Intro. Mr. Schwann; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 168

"Political" Prisoners (see *Treason Felony*, Daly and Egan, Fenians, &c.)

Polling Cards Postage, 1494

**Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 61]

Intro. Mr. Webb; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162

Poor Law (Indoor and Outdoor) Relief (See also *Pauper Relief*)

Return ordered, 800

Return for Ireland, Motion, 1613

**Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill**  
[c. No. 199]

Intro. Mr. Mahony; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1330

Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 1711

**Poor Rate (Metropolis) Bill** [c. No. 67]

Intro. Mr. Pickersgill; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 163

PORTLAND, Duke of

A Lord Commissioner, 1

Portland Prison Staff, 1626

Portsmouth and Ryde Mail Contract

Copy ordered and pres., 41

Contract approved, 1376

**POST OFFICE**

Postmaster General (see *Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson*)

**Ireland**

*Ashgrove Sub-Post*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 882

*Bere Island, Increased Facilities*, Q. Mr. Gilhooly, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1623

*Bushmills as a Post Office*, Q. Macartney, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1795

*Castlecomer, New Route*, Q. Mr. Macdermott, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1227

*Cork Complaints*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 681

*Cushendun Mails, Delay in*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1625

*Dublin Junction Railway*, Q. Mr. T. W. Russell, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 894

*Harold's Cross, Closing of*, Q. Sir T. Esmonde, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 903

[cont.]

*POST OFFICE—Ireland—cont.*

- Macroon District Service*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 882  
*Postage of Requisition Forms*, Q. Mr. Roche, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1212  
*Rathcoole and Kilcorrey*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1372  
*Rathvilly, Telegraph Station for*, Q. Dr. Tanner, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1792  
*Sorting Clerks at Dublin*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 315  
*Stranraer and Larne Mail Service*, Q. Mr. Lea, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 188; Q. Captain M'Calmont, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 882; Qs. Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Sexton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1207  
*Sub-Postmasters' Salaries*, Q. Mr. Tuite, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 883  
*Subsidies to Irish Railways*, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 561  
*Sunday and Night Duty, Dublin*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1512  
*Telegraph Stations, County Galway*, Q. Mr. Sheehy, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 562  
*Tipperary* (see Upperchurch)  
*Trippage Allowance with Mails*, Q. Mr. Jordan, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1623  
*Upperchurch Sunday Post*, Qs. Mr. P. J. O'Brien, As. Sir J. Fergusson, 1519, 1635  
*Ventry and Fenit Telegraphs*, Q. Sir T. Esmonde, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1385  
*Wexford, Faster Mail Service*, Q. Mr. Sexton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1522  
*Wicklow Mails*, Q. Mr. W. Corbet, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 446  
*Woodford and Whitegate Post and Telegraph Service*, 1215, 1522

*Mails and Post Offices*

- Delays in Fleet Street Delivery*, Qs. Mr. Baumann, Mr. Bigwood, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1632  
*Eastern Mails and Salonica*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 202  
*"Germanic" Mails. Delay by Breakdown*, Q. Mr. Leug, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 313  
*Portsmouth and Ryde Contract*, 41, 1576

*Miscellaneous*

- Charges for Re-addressing*, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 692  
*Deficient Postage*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 903  
*Forman's, Mr., Mission*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 201  
*Friendly Societies' Circulars*, Q. Major Rasch, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1384  
*Indian and Colonial Stamps. Sale of*, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 451  
*Irregularities in Post Office*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 902  
*Members' Letters*, Q. Mr. Flynn, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1242

cont.

*POST OFFICE—Miscellaneous—cont.*

- Letter Cards, Income from*, Q. Mr. Gourley, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1496  
*Parcel Post and Dairy Produce*, Q. Sir E. Grey, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 811  
*Parcel Post (U.S.A. and Great Britain)*, 300  
*Polling or Voting Cards*, Q. Mr. Cremer, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1392; Q. Mr. E. Spencer, As. Sir J. Fergusson, 1494, 1636  
*Private Post Cards*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 451

*Officials*

- Clerks, Inequality of Pay*, 887  
*Edinburgh Post Office*, Q. Mr. R. Wallace, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1368  
*Harlesden Postmaster*, Q. Mr. Cobb, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1014  
*Postal Officials Dismissed*, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 902  
*Rural Postmen*, Q. Mr. Seale-Hayne, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 685; *Pay, &c.*, Q. Mr. Philipps, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1213  
*Soldiers as Rural Postmen*, Q. Mr. H. R. Farquharson, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1794  
*Stampers and Box Clearers*, Q. Mr. Seale-Hayne, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1616  
*Welsh-speaking Postmasters*, Q. Mr. Bryn Roberts, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1221

*Scotland*

- Aberdeen Postmaster's Retirement*, Q. Mr. Esslemont, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 198  
*Glasgow Postal Districts*, Q. Mr. Watt, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 877  
*Glasgow subordinated to Edinburgh Office*, Qs. Dr. Cameron, Sir G. Trevelyan, Mr. Caldwell, As. Sir J. Fergusson, 564, 689  
*Mail Contracts*, Q. Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1497  
*Mull and Oban Posts*, Q. Mr. Esslemont, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1370

*Telegraphs*

- Accounts Presented* [No. 21], 300  
*Cable Companies*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1387  
*Clerks in Central Office*, Q. Mr. McCartan, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 887  
*Continental Receipts*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1366  
*Guarantees against Cost of Construction*, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 692  
*Money Orders by Telegraph*, Q. Mr. H. Heaton, A. Sir James Fergusson, 1499  
*Railway Companies Telegrams*, Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 881; *Numbers*, Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1501  
*Shetland Cables*, Q. Mr. Lyell, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1776  
*Telephone Exchanges*, Q. Dr. Cameron, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 1224

**POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Wigan***Church Buildings Acts (Compulsory Powers  
Repeal) Bill, Intro. 162Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1446  
Shop Hours Bill, 1144**Precedents, Chiltern Hundreds**

Granted while House not Sitting, 462

**Presentation to Benefices Bill** [l.  
No. 24]Presented, Archbishop of York ; Read 1<sup>a</sup>,  
1465Read 2<sup>a</sup>, 1577

Reported, 1760

**PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport***

Greenwich Hospital, 1643

**Printing, Alterations in Text**Qs. Mr. A. O'Connor, Mr. T. M. Healy, As.  
Sir W. Hart Dyke, Mr. Speaker, 687**Prison Commissioners**Q. Mr. Pickersgill, A. Mr. Matthews, 197,  
320**Prisons Act Amendment Bill** [c. No.  
126]Intro. Mr. Channing ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 172**Prison Warders' Claims, 1213, 1626****Private Banks Bill** [c. No. 125]Intro. Mr. E. Spencer ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 172**Private Bill Procedure Bill**

Notice to bring in, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 42

Motion for Leave Debate, 1447, Adj. 1454

**Private Post Cards**

Permission to use, and cost, 451

**Privileges, Committee of, 41****Procurator Fiscal, Ross and Cromarty**

Q. Dr. McDonald, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 567

**Property Assessments**

Q. Mr. Morton, A. Mr. Goschen, 322

**Prosecution, An Anarchist**

Charge against Mr. Cavagna, 697

**PROVAND, Mr. A. D., *Glasgow, Black-  
friars***Dwelling Houses, Re-letting (Scotland) Bill,  
Intro. 324**PROVAND, Mr. A. D.—cont.**

Indian Factory Act Regulations, 812

Shop Hours Bill, 2R. 1129, 1185

**Public Accounts**

Com. ordered (Sir J. Gorst), 1125

**Public Authorities Protection Bill**

[l. No. 31]

Presented, Lord Chancellor ; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1760**Public Health (Interments) Act  
(1879) Amendment Bill** [c. No.  
107]Intro. Mr. J. W. Sidebotham ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 169**Public Houses (Hours of Closing)  
(Scotland) Bill** [c. No. 92]Intro. Dr. Cameron ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167

2R. Adj. 409 ; deferred, 554

Adjourned, 1185

**Public Libraries Law Consolidation  
Bill** [c. No. 143]Intro. Sir J. Lubbock ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 299**Public Meetings in Schoolrooms**

Reso. Mr. H. Gardner, 1403

**PULESTON, Sir John H., *Devonport***

County Court Judges in Wales, 837, 842, 847

The Church in Wales, 1071

**Purchase of Land and Congested  
Districts (Ireland) Act (1891)  
Amendment Bill** [c. No. 30]Intro. Mr. Roche ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158**Queen's Plates in Ireland**

Q. Mr. O'Keeffe, A. Mr. Jackson, 885

**Queen's Printers, Alteration of Text by,  
687****Queen's Speech (see title *PARLIA-  
MENT*)****QUILTER, Mr. W. C., *Suffolk, Su lbury***

Beer Adulteration (No. 2) Bill, Intro. 572

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 952

**Railway Accidents Return, 877****Railway Companies and Post Office**

Q. Mr. J. Ellis, A. Sir J. Fergusson, 882

[cont.]

**Railway Rates and Charges Order Confirmation Bills**

1. North Eastern Railway, 118
2. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, 118
3. Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, 118
4. Abbotsbury Railway, 118
5. North Staffordshire Railway, 118
6. London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 118
7. Midland and South Western Junction Railway, 119
8. Taff Vale Railway, 119
- Q. If to be referred to Com., 1024

**Railway Rates and Charges Provisional Order Bills**

Reso. for Joint Com. of Lords and Commons, 1331, 1465, 1577

**Railway Servants' Hours, 569**

Re-appointment of Select Committee, 573  
Minutes of Evidence previous Com. ordered, 1000  
Addition to Select Com. 1331

**Railway Shareholders (Licensing Session) Bill [c. No. 76]**

Intro. Mr. Maclure; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164

**Railways, Overcrowding on, 898, 1390****Railway Station Names**

Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan, A. Sir M. Hicks Beach, 673

**Ramsgate Harbour**

Receipts of Payments, 1890-91, 412

**RANDELL, Mr. D., Glamorganshire, Gower**

County Court Judges in Wales, 850

**Ranges Act (1891) Amendment Bill [c. No. 166]**

Intro. Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

**RASCH, Major F. C., Essex, S.E.**

Army Pensions, 1208  
Army Veterans, Relief to, 461  
Friendly Societies' Circulars, 1384  
Queen's Speech, 379

**Rates, Landlord and Tenant, 1525****RATHBONE, Mr. W., Carnarvonshire, Arfon**

Limited Partnerships Bill, Intro. 806

**Rating of Machinery Bill [c. No. 31]**

Intro. Mr. G. Balfour; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 158

**Reciprocity Agreement**

Trade between Canada and United States, 680

**Recreation Grounds Bill [c. No. 201]**

Intro. Mr. Llewellyn; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1642

**Recruiting Committee (see ARMY)****REDMOND, Mr. John E., Waterford**

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1672, 1675  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 726  
Morning Sittings, 1640  
Queen's Speech, 236, on Amendment, 502  
Railway Servants' Hours Select Committee, 575

**REDMOND, Mr. W. H. K., Fermanagh, N.**

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 793  
Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 648  
Millbank Prison Bill, 800  
Nominations of Governors to Asylums, 31  
Queen's Speech, 290 (Treason Felony Prisoners), 333, 336  
Westminster Abbey, Chapels closed, 677

**Red Sea Lighting**

Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton, A. Mr. J. Lowther, 816

**REED, Mr. H. Byron, Bradford, E.**

Queen's Speech, Address, 115  
The Church in Wales, 1097

**REED, Sir Edward J., Cardiff**

Case of James Wall, 673

**Registries, District**

Number where Writs can be Issued, 694  
Absence of, in Belfast, 889

**Registration Acts (Lodgers) Amendment Bill [c. No. 79]**

Intro. Mr. O. V. Morgan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

**Registration of Voters (Scotland) Bill [c. No. 152]**

Intro. Mr. Shiress Will; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

**Registry of Deeds (Ireland)**

Treasury Warrants of Appointments, 663

**REID, Mr. Robert T., Dumfries, &c.**

Casualties (Scotland) Bill, Intro. 664  
Local Authorities (Land) Bill, Intro. 664

**Distress (Ireland)**  
of Relief Works pres., 1932

**f Poor Returns, 820**

**s Freedom in Russia**  
Cobb, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther, 447

**L, Mr. J. A., Down, E.**  
Government (Ireland) Bill, 768

**of Gold (see Currency)**

**t Magistrates (Ireland)**  
ordered (Mr. John Ellis), 1000

**ment, Civil Service, 684, 1395**

**ing Officers' Expenses (Scotland) Bill [c. No. 49]**

Mr. Esslemont; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161

**Tickets Bill [c. No. 83]**

Mr. Morton; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

**s Parliamentary Debates**

J. Ellis, Mr. Labouchere, A. Sir J. t, 443

**f Contract Presented, 558**

r. Leng, Mr. S. Buxton, As. Sir J. t, 884, 1227, 1516

**anges, Newtownards and Port-  
rnoch**

r. Macartney, Mr. Clancy, A. Mr. hope, 826

**of Way (Scotland) Bill [c. No.**

Mr. Buchanan; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161

**of Way (Scotland) [No. 2]  
1 [c. No. 156]**

Sir C. Dalrymple; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 324

**IE, Right Hon C. T. (President  
the Local Government Board),  
ver Hamlets, St. George's**

**ents, Number under 1887 Act, 897**

**· Council Stock and Accounts, 1014**

**to Guardians and Magistrates, 1497**

**itary Schools, Rating of, 1387**

**and Irwell (Prevention of Pollution)  
1363**

**Auditors, County Councils, 1368**

**· Relief Return, 821**

**aw (Ireland) Relief, 1613**

**Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1430, 1443**

**Agricultural Holdings Bill, 931**

**RITCHIE, Right Hon. C. T.—cont.**

**Tuberculosis, Commission on, 899, 1927**

**Vaccination Commission, 1498, 1782**

**Whitehaven Sanitary District, 1871**

**Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Acts  
Amendment Bill [l. No. 33]**

Presented, Lord Ker; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1760

**ROBERTS, Mr. J. Bryn, Carnarvonshire,  
Eifion**

**County Court Judges in Wales, 856**

**Places of Worship Enfranchisement Bill,  
Intro., 157**

**Welsh-speaking Postmasters, 1221**

**ROBERTSON, Mr. E., Dundee**

**Crimean, &c., Pensions, 1013**

**Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill,  
1279**

**Local Government (Scotland) Act (1889)  
Amendment Bill, Intro. 1127**

**Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Law Amend-  
ment Bill, Intro. 1127**

**ROBINSON, Mr. T., Gloucester**

**Error in Division List, 613**

**ROBY, Mr. H. J., Lancashire, S.E.,  
Eccles**

**Albert University, 455**

**Business of the House, 1821**

**Licences in Mortmain, 1506**

**Ordnance Survey, Select Com. ordered, 300**

**Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1429, 1445**

**Queen's Speech (Treason Felony Prisoners),  
349**

**Shop Hours Bill, 1178**

**Supply—Embassies Vote, 1829**

**ROCHE, Mr. J., Galway, East**

**Lord Ashbrook's Estate Evictions, 566**

**Purchase of Land and Congested Districts  
(Ireland) Act (1891) Amendment Bill,  
Intro. 158**

**Requisition Forms Postage, 1212**

**ROLLIT, Sir A. K., Islington, S.**

**Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act  
(1890) Amendment Bill, Intro. 172; 212.  
607**

**Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to  
Women) Bill, Intro. 159**

**Queen's Speech, Address, 135**

**Ross's, Senator J. G., Estate**

**Q. Mr. Hozier, A. Mr. Curzon, 1392**

**ROUND, Mr. J., Essex, N.E., Harwich**

**Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 953**

**“Round Table,” The, 214, 215**

[cont.]



**ROWLANDS, Mr. James, *Finsbury, E.***

Greenwich Hospital, 1465  
 Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Wales) Bill,  
 Intro. 664  
 London County Council (Tramways) Bill,  
 1474  
 Millbank Prison Bill, 799  
 Morning Sittings, 1813  
 Pouches and Belts Contract, 696  
 Open-air Meetings in London, 1232  
 Sittings of the House, 1823  
 Small Arms Factory, Enfield, 1016  
 Stationery Office Waste Paper Department,  
 1022  
 Town Holdings Bill, Intro. 168  
 World's End, Chelsea, Meetings, 1529

**ROWLANDS, Mr. W. Bowen, *Cardigan-shire***

County Court Judges in Wales, 839

**ROWNTREE, Mr. J., *Scarborough***

Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 953, 967

**Royal Irish Rifles, Training, 455****Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, 191,  
1026, 1617, 1629*****Royal Niger Company***

Q. Mr. W. H. Cross, A. Mr. J. W. Lowther,  
 1775

**Royalties, Gold Mining, 679, 823****Rural Labourers' Cottages Bill [c.  
No. 138]**

Intro. Lord Henry Bruce; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 298

**Rural Population, Movement of, 10,  
26, 134****Rural Postmen, 685, 1213, 1794****Rural Sanitary Authorities**

Allotment Tenants and Acreage, 897

**RUSSELL, Sir Charles, *Hackney, S.***

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
 1609  
 Justices of the Peace Bill, 589, 596  
 Queen's Speech, Address, 89

**RUSSELL, Mr. T. W., *Tyrone, S.***

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill,  
 1351  
 Congested Districts Boards, 464  
 Dublin Junction Railway and Mails, 894  
 Evicted Tenants and Land Purchase, 1385  
 Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1671, 1681,  
 1699

**RUSSELL, Mr. T. W.—*cont.***

Green Street Court House, Dublin, 45  
 881  
 Irish Education Return, 194, 458  
 Irish Land Commission, 203  
 Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 652  
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 733  
 Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 629  
 National Education (Ireland) Bill, 975, 99  
 997  
 Representation of East Belfast, Petition  
 117  
 Schools (Ireland), Return ordered, 1641  
 Supply—National Teachers' Fund, 1539

**Russia, Religious Freedom in  
Oppression of "Stundists," 447****Sale of Food and Drugs Act (187  
Amendment Bill [c. No. 168]**

Intro. Dr. Cameron; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

**Sale of Goods Bill [c. No. 32]**

Presented Lord Herschell; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1760

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (En  
land) Bill [c. No. 97]**

Intro. Mr. Allison; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Su  
days Bill [c. No. 50]**

Intro. Mr. Broadhurst; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 161

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Ch  
dren Bill [c. No. 40]**

Intro. Mr. Conybeare; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159

**SALISBURY, Bishop of**

Technical Education and County Council  
 1462

**SALISBURY, MARQUESS OF (Pri  
Minister and Secretary of Sta  
for Foreign Affairs)**

East India Officers' Bill, 437, 1195  
 London Fog, 309  
 Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill, 411  
 Police Protection in Ireland, 178  
 Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 2  
 Smoke Nuisance (Metropolis) Bill, 1754

**Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) A  
Amendment Bill [c. No. 112]**

Intro. Mr. Macartney; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 170  
 2R. Deferred, 554; Read 2<sup>o</sup>, 801

**Salonica as an Eastern Mail Route, 5****Salvation Army, Eastbourne, 10  
1219**

ELSON, Mr. G. B., *Gloucester, Forest of Dean*  
in Lands Office, 1638

s, Colonel T. M., *Lancashire, W., Bootle*  
ps' Authority Regulation Bill, Intro.

ry Authorities and Influenza, 190

ry Conference at Venice  
of Protocol, 669

s, Yellow Fever at, 1631

ERSON, Colonel E. J., *Armagh, N. Loom Weaving (Ireland) Bill*, Intro.

's Speech (on Irish Amendment), 529

s *Bank Act, Inspection Committee*

Ir. John Ellis, As. Mr. Goschen, 189,

Attendances, Highlands, &c.  
nsibility of Parents, 878

Books in Voluntary Schools,  
6

Board for London, 1646, 1796

**Board for London (Super-  
nuation) Bill** [c. No. 96]

Sir R. Temple; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 167

NN, Mr. C. E., *Manchester, N.*

Spanish Tariff, 319

ian Prisoners, 457

ess of the House, 1822

ercial Treaty with Brazil, 823

and Deaths from Drowning, 194

on Labour Commission, 461

y and Irwell (Pollution) Bill, 1365

Tax in Ceylon, 201

Disabilities Removal (Extension) Bill,  
o. 168

's Speech, Address, 87

and Art Examinations, 1508

## AND

ary for (see *Marquess of Lothian*)

Advocate (see *Pearson, Sir C. J.*)

en *Postmaster*, 198

e *Sheriff Substitute*, Q. Dr. Cameron,  
Sir C. J. Pearson, 1220

[. [NEW (FOURTH) SERIES]

. CCCLVII., O.S.]

## SCOTLAND—cont.

*Building Land (Scotland) Bill*, Mr. M. Ferguson, 922

*Carlowsay Pier*, Q. Dr. McDonald, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1526

*Contracts and English Law*, Q. Mr. Buchanan, A. Sir J. Gorst, 1508

*Crofters' Commissioners Decisions*, Q. Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1496

*Crofter Emigration*, Q. Mr. Seton-Karr, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 459

*Deer Forests Return*, Q. Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 317

*Edinburgh Museum Clerks*, Q. Mr. Wallace, A. Sir W. H. Dyke, 1214

*Education and Local Taxation Relief (Scotland) Bill*, Q. 571, Leave, 1245, 1316, Q. 1398, 1530

*Education Code*, Q. Mr. Caldwell, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1229

"*Equivalent Grant*," Q. Mr. Bryce, A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, 199

*Fee Grant*, 1460, 1575

*Garve and Ullapool Railway*, Q. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1620

*Government of Scotland Bill*, Mr. Hunter, 163

*Highlands and Islands, School Attendance*, Q. Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 878

*Illegal Trawling*, Qs. Mr. Duff, Mr. M. Ferguson, Mr. H. T. Anstruther, As. Sir C. J. Pearson, 874, 875

*Mull and Oban Post*, 1370

*Pier and Harbour Works*, Q. Mr. Buchanan, A. Sir M. H. Beach, 563

*Police and Public Health Bill*, Q. Mr. Eslemon, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1774

*Railway Monopoly*, 1500

*Representative Peer*, 5

*Returning Officers Expenses Bill*, Mr. Eslemon, 161

*Rights of Way (Scotland) Bill*, Mr. Buchanan, 161, Sir C. Dalrymple, 324

*Ross and Cromarty Procurator Fiscal*, Q. Dr. McDonald, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 567

*Sasine Office Clerks*, Q. Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Mr. Akers-Douglas, 1499

*Scottish Poorhouses, Deaths in*, Q. Mr. H. Stewart, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1493

*Scottish Prisons Report*, Q. Mr. Caldwell, A. Sir J. Gorst, 895

*Trawling Prohibition*, Q. Col. Nolan, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 1382 (see also *Illegal*, above)

*University Tests*, Q. Mr. Bryce, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 814

*Valuation of Lands Amendment Bill*, Mr. Robertson, 1127

*West Highlands, &c., Committee*, Q. Mr. F. Mackintosh, A. Sir J. Gorst, 319

Seamen's Wages and Effects, Deceased

Account presented, 412

**SELBORNE, Earl of**

Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, 1737

**Select Vestries Bill**1. Presented; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 38

“ Separation, Home Rule or,” 101

**SETON-KARR, Mr. H., *St. Helen's***

Colonisation Vote, 1020

Crofter Emigration, 458

Income Tax Assessments, 1021

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 802

Shop Hours Bill, 1176

**SEXTON, Mr. T., *Belfast, N.***

Advances under Land Purchase Act, 812

Applications under Land Purchase Act, 459

Belfast City Central Station, &amp;c., Bill, 2R. 1333

Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) Bill, 2R. 1334, 1339, 1941, 1346, 1352, 1355, 1588, 1601

Betting in Belfast Streets, 567

Clare Constabulary, 1782

Collector General of Rates, 699

Congested Districts Board, 1009

Cushendun Mails, 1625

De Cobain, Mr., 43, 207

District Registry for Belfast, 889

Dundrum Lunatic Asylum, 1501

East India Company Pensioners, 1499

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1677, 1695, 1697

Financial Relations Committee, 1017

Gallagher, Dr. Thomas, 672

Green Street Court House, 881

Haulbowline Dock, 816

Holywood Pier, Co. Down, 817

Irish Education Bill, 1244

Irish Education Grants, 570

Irish Land Commission, 203

Irish Pawnbrokers, 200

Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 608

Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill, 1884

Local Courts of Bankruptcy Bill, 1575

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 737, 776, 782, 1188

Morning Sitings, 1639, 1814

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 634, 643, 647, 1186

Nally, the late Convict, 1380, 1518, 1778, 1779

National Teachers' Fund, in Supply, 1532, 1543, 1553, 1557; Q. 1798

Oyer and Terminer Commission, 1620

Queen's Speech, Address, 117; Treason Felony Prisoners, 362; Local Government, 468

Railway Servants' Hours, Select Com. 575

Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, 818

Weekly Wages Bill, Intro. 166

Wexford Mails, 1522

**Shallard, Mr., Dismissal of, 823****SHAW-STEWART, Mr. M. H., *Renfrew,***

Education and Local Taxation, &amp;c., B 1307

**SHEEHY, Mr. D., *Galway, S.***

Parliamentary Elections Bill, Intro. 165

Telegraphic Stations in Galway, 562

**Sheriff Clerks' Depute (Scotland) Bill [c. No. 197]**Intro. Mr. Philipps; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1390**Sheriff Court Civil Code (Scotland) Bill [c. No. 101]**Intro. Mr. Caldwell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 168**Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Extract Bill [c. No. 119]**Intro. Mr. Caldwell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

Ships' Stern Lights, 1501

**Shop Hours Bill [c. No. 26]**Intro. Mr. Channing; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 157

Debated, 1129-1183; Division, Read 1184

**Shops (Weekly Half-Holiday) B [c. No. 142]**Intro. Sir John Lubbock; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 299

2R deferred, 1185

**Short Titles Bill [l. No. 12]**Presented, Lord Chancellor; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 415Read 2<sup>a</sup>, 1463, com., 1464

Reported and Re-com. 1760

Siam, Kingdom of, 15

Rep. pres. of Journey, Mè-Kong Valley, 6

**SIDEBOTHAM, Mr. J. W., *Cheshire, Hyde***Public Health (Interments) Act (18<sup>th</sup>) Amendment Bill, Intro. 169

Signalling Instruction, 1800

“ Skimpin, Mr.,” 213

**Slave Trade, Repression of, 150, 1836**

Vessels Taken, Slaves Liberated, 1225

**Small Agricultural Holdings B [c. No. 183]**Intro. Mr. Chaplin; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 911

Small Arms Factories, 892

(See under *ARMY*)

Small Holdings, 27, 34, 126, 144

**Small Holdings Bill** [c. No. 148]

Intro. Mr. J. Collings; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 322

**Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill**  
[c. No. 177]

Intro. Mr. Haldane; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 806

**SMITH, Mr. James Parker, Lanark,**  
*Partick*

East African Slave Trade, 1225

Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill,  
1232

General Police and Improvement (Scotland)  
Act (1862) Amendment Bill, Intro. 1127

Tuberculosis Commission, 899

**SMITH, Mr. Samuel, Flintshire**

Church of England in Wales, Resolution,  
1033

Opium Trade in Bombay, 185

Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 81

**SMITH, Mr. W. H., the late, 52, 73,**  
134, 210

**Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metro-**  
**polis) Bill** [l. No. 9]

Presented, Lord Stratheden and Campbell;  
Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 173

Notice of 2R. 1189

Debated, 1746; Read 2<sup>a</sup>, 1755

**Solicitors' Apprentices (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 85]

Intro. Mr. O'Neill; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 166

2R. Deferred, 558

**Solicitors' (Magistracy) Bill** [c. No.  
128]

Intro. Mr. Maclure; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 172

**SOMERVELL, Mr. J., Ayr, &c.**

Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill,  
1262, 1316

Southampton Docks Bill, 1581

South Australia, Northern Territory of,  
877

*South Kensington Museum*

Q. Mr. Bartley, A. Mr. Plunket, 566

**Spain (Tariff)**

Renewal of Treaty, 319

**Speaker, The (RIGHT HON. ARTHUR**  
**WELLESLEY PEEL), Warwick and**  
**Leamington**

#### MISCELLANEOUS

Interruption by Mr. Maden, 12 Feb., 388

Omission of Mr. W. A. Macdonald's Vote,  
15 Feb., 466

Rising First—Mr. McCarthy or Mr. J. Red-  
mond, 18 Feb., 726

Mr. Sexton's Interruption, 18 Feb., 737

Calling of Mr. De Cobain, 23 Feb., 1032

"Personal Altercations," 24 Feb., 1162

Seconding an Amendment, 24 Feb., 1176

Declining to put Question, 26 Feb., 1355

Asking for Question to be put, 26 Feb., 1383

Amended Motion *re* Mr. De Cobain, 26 Feb.,  
1402

Question to be put, 26 Feb., 1433

Irrelevancy, 1 March, 1608, 3 March, 1800,  
1818

#### RULINGS

Mr. J. G. S. MacNeill: "I will now proceed,  
with the permission of the House, to move  
the Amendment I have upon the Paper."

**Mr. SPEAKER—**

"The Amendment which appears on the  
Paper contains a number of subjects it  
would not be proper to move upon an  
Address to the Queen's Speech. What I  
wish to point out to the hon. Member is  
that some portions of his Amendment are  
not relevant."—12 Feb., 396

Mr. J. E. Redmond: "I beg to move that  
the Question be now put."

**Mr. SPEAKER—**

"Considering that this Debate has only lasted  
for one hour since the time when the  
hon. Member who introduced the Bill  
sat down, and other hon. Members have  
risen to speak on both sides of the House,  
I think further time should be allowed for  
the discussion of the Bill."—17 Feb., 661

Mr. A. O'Connor: "Mr. Speaker, I would wish  
to ask you, Sir, in the case of varying and  
doubtful texts, or an official issue being  
made of certain words, is it competent for  
any Department to direct the printers to  
alter the text without the authority of an  
Act of Parliament?"

**Mr. SPEAKER—**

"I think the proper test to apply would be  
whether there were any error either here  
or in the House of Lords. There has  
been no error. The Clerk in this House  
and the Clerk in the House of Lords  
made the proper entry, and the defect  
arose purely from an error of the drafts-  
man, which perhaps he had been led into.  
The true record is the signed copy of the  
Act, which is perfectly correct."—18 Feb.,  
688

Petition against Opium Trade read by Clerk  
at the Table. Mr. MacNeill: "I beg to  
ask you, Mr. Speaker, can this Petition be  
placed on the Minutes of the House, and  
appear as part of our proceedings?"

[cont.]

SPEAKER, THE—*cont.*|| *Mr. SPEAKER—*

"It will be treated as Petitions are treated—in the ordinary way."—19 Feb., 810.

Mr. Chance: "That the Bill be referred to a Hybrid Committee of seven Members, and that the Committee have power to appoint the hon. Member for West Belfast as one of the Members."

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The proper course is to wait until the Bill is committed. When the Bill is committed, it can then be settled what proportion of Members shall constitute the Hybrid Committee."—26 Feb., 1363

Referring to Mr. H. Gardner.

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The hon. Member has no right of reply, as there is no Amendment before the House."—26 Feb., 1425

Mr. W. Johnston: "The sharp practice of the hon. Member, &c."

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"I do not think that the hon. Member should use such a phrase. Such an expression cannot be permitted."—26 Feb., 1432

Mr. T. M. Healy: "I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not always the practice of the Government on Fridays to set up Supply a second time?"

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"That entirely depends upon the Government, and the time of night."—26 Feb., 1447

Mr. Boulnois: "If, Sir, I do not oppose the Second Reading of the Bill now, and wish to move the Reference of the Bill to a Hybrid Committee, should I be able to make that Motion now or at a later day?"

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The Bill, if unopposed, will be read a second time and referred to an ordinary Select Committee. It will be open to the hon. Member to move the discharge of the Order for reference to a Select Committee, and to move that the Bill be referred to a Hybrid Committee."

Mr. Boulnois: "Shall I be able to do that now if the Second Reading is unopposed?"

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The Question now is the Second Reading, and whether this is opposed or not a subsequent Motion may, as Opposed Business, be deferred to a later day."

[Later] Mr. Boulnois: "I give notice that to-morrow I shall make the Motion for the reference of the Bill to a Hybrid Committee."

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The hon. Member should in terms make his Motion now."—3 March, 1772

Mr. A. J. Balfour: "It may be convenient for the House if I were to ask you, Sir, what interpretation should be put upon

*[cont.]*SPEAKER, THE—*cont.*

the phrase "financial business," before it is adopted?"

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"I think it is rather a matter for the House itself. But looking at the words which are used, I should say they included Supply, the Report of Supply, and the Ways and Means Bill; and unless a limitation 'until Easter' is introduced into the proposition, it will, of course, apply to the Budget. That would be the natural interpretation I should be disposed to put upon it; but it is a matter for the House, and I am not the arbiter of the question."—3 March, 1808

Mr. Sexton: "I beg to move, after the word 'Friday,' to insert these words 'except Tuesday, 29th March.'"

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"There is already a Motion before the House to restrict the operation of this Resolution until Easter, and that Resolution I will put from the Chair."—3 March, 1814

Referring to Mr. Conybeare.

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"The hon. Member is discussing the merits of a particular Bill, and not the appropriation of a particular day."—3 March, 1817

Mr. Cremer: "I understood that I should be able to move this Amendment."

*Mr. SPEAKER—*

"No; the hon. Member is precluded from so doing by having already spoken on the Main Question."—3 March, 1820

Deputy Speaker and CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (RIGHT HON. L. H. COURTNEY), *Cornwall, Bodmin*

Referring to Mr. Labouchere.

*The CHAIRMAN—*

"The hon. Gentleman is not to enter into the subject of the original Vote, except so far as it is necessary to illustrate the present Vote."—25 Feb., 1318.

Referring to Dr. Clark.

*The CHAIRMAN—*

"The Motion before the Committee is to report Progress. If the discussion on the Vote is to go on, the Motion to report Progress should be withdrawn."—29 Feb., 1555.

*Special Commissionership, Income Tax*  
Q. Mr. Bartley, A. Mr. Goschen, 567

SPENCER, Mr. J. E., *West Bromwich*,  
Department of Labour Bill, Intro. 160  
Designs for New Coinage, 196  
Postage of Voting Cards, 1494  
Private Banks Bill, Intro. 172

Stamp Distributor at Goole, 1637

## Stamps, Indian and Colonial, 451

STANHOPE, RIGHT HON. E. (Secretary of State for War), *Lincolnshire, Horncastle*

Army Socks, Contract Prices, 677  
 Autumn Manœuvres, 1615  
 Balacava Survivors, 1381, 1504, 1605  
 Burma, Military Forces in, 1621  
 Carlow Barracks, 1791  
 Constable Courtney, 1395  
 Contracts and Government Factories, 314, 315  
 Crimean and Indian Mutiny Pensions, 1013  
 Deferred Pensions, 1209  
 Enfield Factory Dismissals, 1378  
 Government Factory, Cutters' Pay, 1238  
 Henry Barrel Company Contract, 1016, 1515  
 Jeffries, G. L., Dismissal of, 679  
 Jobson, Mr., Case of, 680  
 Military Lands Consolidation Bill, Intro. 1000, 2R. 1883  
 Military Leave (India), 1512  
 Militia and Volunteer Artillery, 1615  
 Militia Artillery Candidates, 463  
 Naval Artillery Volunteers, 1026, 1629  
 New Magazine Rifle, 1634  
 Newtownards Rifle Range, 826  
 Norfolk Militia Training, 822  
 Ordnance Store Department, Labourers, 671  
 Pensioners and Reserve Men employed by War Office, 1234  
 Pouches and Belts Contract, 696  
 Presbyterian Army Chaplains, 1210  
 Recruiting Committee's Report, 1027  
 Retirement Rules, 1515  
 Rifle Range at Portmarnock, 826  
 Roberts, Lord, and Lord Wantage's Committee, 1223  
 Royal Irish Rifles, Training of, 455  
 Shallard's, Mr., Dismissal, 823  
 Signalling Instruction, 1800  
 Small Arms Factory, Prices, 891  
 Survivors of Crimean and Indian Campaigns Relief, 462  
 Terms of Service, Report of Committee, 455  
 Unclaimed Balances, Deceased Soldiers, 1233  
 Unpensioned Veterans, 811  
 Volunteer Commanding Officers, 561  
 Wantage Committee, 1516  
 Webster's, Sergeant Major, Pension, 1012  
 Woolwich Arsenal Labourers, 1622  
 Woolwich Arsenal Night Work, 824

STANHOPE, Hon. Philip, *Wednesbury*  
 Supply—Embassies Vote, 1827

STANSFELD, Right Hon. James, *Halifax*

Electors' Qualification and Registration Bill, Intro. 159

## State Pensions, 901

*Stationery Office*

Contractors Circular, Q. Mr. Pickersgill, A. Sir John Gorst, 564

Waste Paper Department, Qs. Mr. J. Rowlands, Mr. Conybeare, As. Sir John Gorst, 1022, 1221

## Statute Law Revision Bill [c. No. 29]

Presented Lord Chancellor; Read 1<sup>a</sup>, 1760

## Steam Engines (Persons in Charge) Bill [c. No. 41]

Intro. Mr. Fenwick; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 159

STERN, Mr. S., *Suffolk, Stowmarket*

Housing of the Working Classes Bill, Intro. 164

STEVENSON, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, Eye*

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 788  
 Pensions and Superannuations, 1528, 1785  
 Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1427  
 Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 960, 967

STEVENSON, Mr. James, *South Shields*

Deck Cargoes Bill, Intro. 169  
 Southampton Docks Bill, 1587

STEWART, Mr. Halley, *Lincolnshire, Spalding*

Scottish Poorhouses, 1493

STEWART, Mr. Mark J., *Kirkcudbright*

Education and Local Taxation, &c. Bill, 1275  
 Opium Trade, Petition, 810  
 Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 949

## STRATHEDEN and CAMPBELL, Lord

Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Bill, Presented 173; 2R. 1746

## Strike of Brushmakers, Sheffield

Application for Industrial School Lads, 462

STUART, Mr. J., *Shoreditch, Hoxton*

Enfield Factory Dismissals, 1378  
 London County Council (Tramways) Bill, 1466  
 Women County Councillors Bill, Intro. 827

## Stundists, Oppression of, 447

## Submarine Mining Volunteers

Naval Artillery Volunteers, Disposal of, 192

## Subsidies to Telegraphs, 692

SULLIVAN, Mr. Donal, *Westmeath, S.*  
Labourers' Cottages in Athlone, 890

SULLIVAN, Mr. T. D., *Dublin, College Green*

Gallagher, Dr. Thomas, 672  
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, 767  
Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 635  
Railway Station Names, 673  
Title of Lord Mayor, Cork, &c. 875

SUMMERS, Mr. W., *Huddersfield*  
McKinley Tariff and West Indies, 1797  
Pauper Relief Return, 820

### Summary Jurisdiction Act (1879) Amendment Bill [c. No. 133]

Intro. Mr. Cross; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 297  
2R. Deferred, 1185

Superannuation Act, 1884  
Treasury Minute *re* W. Lancaster, 1712

### Superannation Acts Amendment Bill [c. No. 191]

Intro. Mr. Goschen; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1127  
Withdrawn, 1575

## SUPPLY

CIVIL SERVICE—(SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES,  
1891-2)

#### CLASS I.

£4,735—Houses of Parliament Buildings  
Com. 25 Feb., 1317; Report 26 Feb., 1459  
£1,500—Art and Science Buildings, Com.  
25 Feb., 1317; Report 26 Feb., 1459  
£20,000—Revenue Department Buildings,  
Com. 25 Feb., 1317; Report 26 Feb., 1459

#### CLASS II.

£498—Lunacy Commission, Scotland, Com.  
25 Feb., 1317; Report 26 Feb., 1459  
£1,690—Public Works Office, Com. 25 Feb.,  
1318; Report 26 Feb., 1459

#### CLASS III.

£2,000—Law Charges, Com. 25 Feb., 1318;  
Report 26 Feb., 1460  
£100—Police Courts, London and Sheerness,  
Com. Division, 25 Feb., 1318; Report 26  
Feb., 1460

#### CLASS V.

£22,600—Expenses of Embassies and Mis-  
sions Abroad, Com. 25 Feb., 1320

#### CLASS VI.

£90,000—Grant in Aid, National School  
Teachers' (Ireland) Pension Fund, Com.  
29 Feb., 1532

#### CLASS VII.

£30,486—Relief of Distress in Ireland, Com.  
29 Feb., 1564

Supreme Court of Judicature  
Return of Circuit Allowances, 1332

SUTHERLAND, Mr. A., *Sutherland*  
Small Agricultural Holdings Bill, 966

Taff Vale Railway  
Provisional Order Bill, 119

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1411, 1445

TANNER, Dr. C. K., *Cork County, Mid*  
Balacava Survivors, 1381  
Carlow Barracks, 1791  
Donegal, Marquess of, 1398  
Haulbowline Dock, 900  
Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill; Intro.  
167; 2R. 410, 1884  
Listowel and Tarbert Railway, 1397  
Newcastle Harbour, County Down, 886  
Postal Arrangements in County Cork, 1372  
Postal Arrangements in Macroom District,  
882  
Rathvilly Telegraph Station, 1792  
Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 905  
Supply—Civil Services, South Africa, 1833,  
1834  
Supply—Embassies Vote, 1324, 1828

Tariffs, Foreign  
Anglo-Spanish Renewal, 319  
Return asked for, 180  
West Indies and United States, 870

Tate's, Mr. Henry, Picture Gallery 446,  
1494

Taxation, Assessments for, 322

### Teachers' Registration and Organisa- tion Bill [c. No. 117]

Intro. Sir R. Temple; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 171

### Teachers' Registration Bill [c. No. 178]

Intro. Mr. A. Acland; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 827

Technical Instruction and County  
Councils, 417, 452, 691, 887, 1463

Telegraphs, &c. (see *POST OFFICES*)

TEMPLE, Sir R., *Worcester, Evesham*  
Elementary Education (Teachers' Superan-  
nation) Select Committee, 555  
Indian Civil Service, Natives in, 825  
Public Meetings in Schoolrooms, 1431  
Queen's Speech, Indian Civil Service, 408  
School Board for London (Superannuation)  
Bill, Intro. 167

TEMPLE, Sir R.—*cont.*

Teachers' Registration and Organisation Bill, Intro. 171

**Tenure of Land Bill** [c. No. 27]

Intro. Mr. T. Ellis; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 157

**Tenure of Land (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 58]

Intro. Mr. T. Dickson; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162

Theatres, &c., Licensing of, 695

*Theological Tests in Scottish Universities*

Q. Mr. Bryce, A. Sir C. J. Pearson, 814

THOMAS, Mr. Abel, *Carmarthen, E.*

County Court Judges in Wales, 843

THOMAS, Mr. Alfred, *Glamorgan, E.*

County Court Judges in Wales, 849

National Institutions (Wales) Bill, Intro. 170

Workhouse Labour, 456

THOMAS, Mr. David A., *Merthyr Tydvil*

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1887) Amendment Bill, Intro. 1330

County Court Judges in Wales, 829

South Wales Colliery Statistics, 1388

Tilbury and Southend Railway

Provisional Order Bill, 118

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*

Queen's Speech, on Irish Amendment, 518

Railway Rates Provisional Orders, 1024

Town Holdings

Select Com. nominated (Mr. A. Douglas), 1330

**Town Holdings Bill** [c. No. 100]

Intro. Mr. J. Rowlands; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 168

**Town Holdings (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 71]

Intro. Mr. O'Hanlon; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 164

**Towns Improvement (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 203]

Intro. Mr. Knox; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1712

Trade Reports (Annual Series)

Copy (Bulgaria) pres. 1712 (Zanzibar), 556

*Trade Societies and Certificates*

Q. Mr. Fenwick, A. Mr. Goschen, 1390

Trade Unions and Board of Trade

Report of Labour Correspondent, 193

**Trade Union Provident Funds Bill** [c. No. 162]

Intro. Mr. Howell; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 572

Trawling (see under *IRELAND* and *SCOTLAND*)

Treason Felony Convicts, 237, 327, 357, 879, 1511

Treasury Chest

Account for 1890-91 pres. 556

Tree Planting in Ireland, 1523

**Trees (Ireland) Bill** [c. No. 80]

Intro. Mr. Knox; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 165

TREVELYAN, Right Hon. Sir George O., *Glasgow, Bridgeton*

Business of the House, 907

Education and Local Taxation, &c., Bill, 1264

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1709

Glasgow and Edinburgh Post Offices, 565, 689

Queen's Speech, on Irish Amendment, 487, 511

Sittings of the House, 1823

Trustee Savings Banks

Return pres. (Sir J. Gorst), 1886

Scheme for Inspection Com. pres. 1331

**Trust Investment Act (1889) Amendment Bill** [c. No. 207]

Intro. Mr. Oldroyd; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1885

**Trusts Bill** [l. No. 20]

Presented, Lord Chancellor; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1189

*Tuberculosis Commission*

Qs. Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. Furness, As. Mr. Ritchie, 899, 1227

TUITE, Mr. J., *Westmeath, N.*

Agricultural Labourers (Ireland) Bill, Intro. 163

Irish Sub-Postmasters' Salaries, 883

Local Inquiries, Labourers Acts, 1218

Mullingar Guardians, 1503

Tunnel Railways in London, 1233

TURKEY

Armenian Prisoners waiting Trial, 457

Erzeroum Consulship, 147, 150



Ulster, 78, 90, 93, 471, 499

Uncovenanted Service (see India)

Uncultivated Land, Area of, 1222

"Unemployed," 50, 133

United States (see *America*)

**University Education (Ireland) Bill**  
[c. No. 62]  
Intro. Mr. Harrison ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 162

University, (see Gresham or Albert)

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889  
Ordinances Nos. 11 to 16 pres. 807

Universities, Scottish, Tests in  
Commissioners' Report, 814

Unpensioned Veterans, 461, 811, 1012,  
1381, 1505

"Unspeakable Turk," 100

*Usibebu, Restoration of*  
Q. Mr. Cobb, A. Baron H. de Worms, 446

*Vaccination Commission*  
Qs. Mr. Channing, Mr. Ballantine, As. Mr.  
Ritchie, 1498, 1782

**Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Law  
Amendment Bill** [c. No. 186]  
Intro. Mr. E. Robertson ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 1127

Veterans, Army, Crimean War, &c.,  
461, 811, 1012, 1381, 1505, 1625

Veterinary Department, 1237

*Vexatious Indictments Acts*  
Q. Mr. Addison, A. Sir R. Webster, 1796

Victoria, H.M.S., Stranding of, 187

VINCENT, Colonel C. E. Howard, *Sheffield,*  
*Central*  
British Colonies and M'Kinley Tariff, 893  
Contracts and Government Factories, 314  
County Council Auditors, 1368  
Foreign Goods (Mark of Origin) Bill, Intro.  
297  
Influenza Epidemic, 189  
M'Kinley Tariff and Reciprocity, 1384  
Old Age Pensions, 202:—State Pensions, 901

VINCENT, Colonel C. E. Howard—*cont.*  
Queen's Speech, Amendment on Addre  
105  
Volunteer Forces (Jury Exemption) B  
Intro. 297  
Woolwich Arsenal Night Work, 824

**Volunteer Forces (Jury Exemptio  
Bill** [c. No. 131]  
Intro. Colonel Howard Vincent ; Read  
297

Volunteer Regiments, Commandin  
Office s, 561

**Voters' Registration Bill** [c. No. 15  
Intro. Mr. Hobhouse ; Read 1<sup>o</sup>, 323

Wages, Fair, 125

Wall, James, Case of, 673

WALLACE, Mr. R., *Edinburgh, E.*  
Edinburgh Museum Clerks, 1214  
Edinburgh Post Office, Retirement, 1368  
Epsom School Children, 1367  
Supply—Civil Services, 1835

WANTAGE, Lord  
Army, Conditions of Service, 174

WARING, Col. T., *Down, N.*  
Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill, Int  
1128  
Belfast Corporation (Lunatic Asylums) B  
1358  
Betting in Belfast Streets, 567  
Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 185  
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1694  
Irish Cattle Truck Rates, 671  
Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, 656  
Labourers' (Ireland) Allotments Bill, 188  
Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill, 641  
Newcastle Harbour, Co. Down, 886  
National Education (Ireland) Bill, 984  
Railway Servants' Hours Select Com., 57

WARMINGTON, Mr. C. M., *Monmou  
W.*  
Contempt of Court (Appeal) Bill, Intro. 1

**WAR OFFICE** (see *ARMY*)  
Secretary of State (see *Right Hon.  
Stanhope*)  
Under Secretary of State (see *E  
Brownlow*)  
Financial Secretary (see *Hon. W. St. J  
Brodrick*)

Washington Maritime Conference, 1

